The Slavic and East European Journal

Vol. XV, No. 4 Winter 1957

CONTENTS

PART ONE

Images of Siberia ..... Victor Erlich 243

Dostoevskij as a Translator ..... Noel Voge 251

Daša Čumalova and Her Successors ..... Xenia Gąsiorowska 260

Slavic Linguistics in Today's Yugoslavia ..... Alexander M. Schenker 272

On the Use of Ablaut as a Criterion in Determining Loan-Words in Baltic and Slavic ..... William R. Schmalstieg 280

The Problem of Predicatives in Russian ..... Morton Benson 284

PART TWO

The Teaching of the Russian Language in American Secondary Schools—Autumn 1957 ..... H. Wilmarth Mott, III 290

NEWS AND NOTES 294

REVIEWS

Hans Kohn, Basic History of Modern Russia; John Shelton Curtiss, The Russian Revolution of 1917; David J. Dallin, The Changing World of Soviet Russia ..... C. E. Black 301

P. N. Miljukov, Vospominanija ..... Michael Ginsburg 304

A. Soloviev and R. Jakobson, Slovo o polku Igoreve v perevodax vosemnadcatogo veka ... Serge Zenkovsky 306

N. A. Gorchakov, Istorija sovetskogo teatra and The Theater in Soviet Russia ..... Peter Yershov 307

Wacław Lednicki, Bits of Table Talk on Pushkin, Mickiewicz, Goethe, Turgenev, and Sienkiewicz ..... H. B. Segel 309

Yar Slavutych, The Muse in Prison ... J. B. Rudnyćkyj 310

J. B. Rudnyćkyj, Slavische und indogermanische Akzentdubletten ..... Edward Stankiewicz 311

J. B. Rudnyćkyj, Ukrainian-Canadian Folklore and Dialectological Texts, I; J. Dziobko, Ukrainian Lemko and Other Folksongs ... Clarence A. Manning 312

Mischa H. Fayer, et al., Simplified Russian Grammar.....Morton Benson 314

(CONTENTS for all of Volume XV, 1957, follow page 315)

THE SLAVIC AND EAST EUROPEAN JOURNAL

Editor

J. T. Shaw
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Review Editor

F. J. Oinas
Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

Editorial Committee

Victor Erlich
University of Washington

Zbigniew Folejewski
University of Wisconsin

William E. Harkins
Columbia University

The Rev. Walter C. Jaskievicz, S.J.
Fordham University

Claude P. Lemieux
U. S. Naval Academy

Horace Lunt
Harvard University

Oleg A. Maslenikov
University of California

J. B. Rudnyćkyj
University of Manitoba

Anthony Salys
University of Pennsylvan

Thomas A. Sebeok
Indiana University

Gleb Struve
University of California

Nicholas Vakar
Wheaton College

René Wellek
Yale University

Business Manager

Edmund Ordon
Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

Note: Articles submitted should follow strictly the directions for typing and style as contained in the MLA Style Sheet and should use the transliteration system employed by this Journal. Unaccepted manuscripts accompanied by postage will be returned.

PART ONE

IMAGES OF SIBERIA

By Victor Erlich

University of Washington

To many a nineteenth-century Russian poet, writer, or publicist the word "Siberia" had an ominous ring. It suggested a harsh penal system, a forbidding climate, a bleak landscape. It called to mind the dire plight of the political exile—whether a native dissenter or a Polish patriot.

It is as an epitome of oppression and desolation that Siberia appears in the pages of Nekrasov's well-known poem "The Russian Women" (1871-72), a moving tribute to the selflessness of Princess Trubetskaja and Princess Volkonskaja, who chose to follow their husbands into the Siberian exile. As her coach plunges into the snow-covered Siberian plain, Trubetskaja cries out in anguish: "Up ahead there is but the stillness of the grave and unrelieved darkness! Why, O accursed land, were you ever discovered by Ermak?"

Nearly forty years later, in a poignant lyric, which decried the dark and oppressive strain in the Russian heritage, Alexander Blok arraigned in a single scornful line "Tsar, Siberia, Ermak, and jail."

On closer scrutiny, however, Russian literature and journalism of the last century yields yet another image of Siberia—a more benevolent and hopeful one. After all, Siberia was not merely a "house of the dead," a penal colony. It was also an important outlet for voluntary—indeed, often extra-legal—colonization. Siberia's natural riches—real as well as imaginary ones—served as a lure for the adventurer, the enterprising profit-seeker. Its vacant lands held a strong attraction for Russian peasants, who ever since the mid-seventeenth century had been fleeing from the miseries of serfdom and from bureaucratic

harassment in what a recent study of Siberian migration calls "a thin but steady stream."[1] This eastward push, which was to acquire considerable vigor under the last two Romanovs, gave rise to and was, in turn, spurred by the notion of Siberia as a dynamic "frontier"—a land of opportunity and a cradle of the Good Society.

It may seem paradoxical that such an optimistic view should have been pioneered by men who had felt the brunt of the grimmer Siberian realities—notably, such second-string Decembrist exiles as Baron Rozen, Basargin, and Puščin. Actually, hopefulness about the potentialities of Siberia's free settlements was very much in keeping with the system of values held by these gentle social reformers. As principled foes of St. Petersburg autocracy, they were apt to be alive to the opportunity for autonomous development inherent in Siberia's very remoteness from the capital and the concomitant weakness of the governmental controls.[2] As "guilt-stricken noblemen," they were predisposed to see in the virtual absence of serfdom from Siberia's land-tenure system a harbinger of a healthier and a more equitable social order than the one they had known and challenged at home.

In his diary, The Notes of a Decembrist, Baron Rozen praised warmly the stamina and the resourcefulness of Siberia's free settlers. "Siberia's destiny," he declared, "may yet equal North America's, where people sought refuge because of their political and religious views ..." "The guarantee of a better future for Siberia," he continued, "lies in that ... it has no land-owning gentry or serfs and but very few officials."[3]

The "American" analogy recurs in another Decembrist memoir. The Siberian, said Basargin, "has a keener sense of dignity than the run-of-the-mill peasant in European Russia.... I have often heard from those who had been to the United States that the Siberians had much in common with the Americans in their habits and customs, indeed in their over-all way of life."[4]

I. I. Puščin, Puškin's Lyceum friend and confidant, in a letter written in 1845, endorsed one of Baron Rozen's main contentions, as he termed the absence of serfdom in Siberia "a blessing which has had an exceedingly healthy influence upon this region." Puščin, too, anticipated hopefully an "American" course of development for Siberia,

including the possibility of its ultimate secession from the "metropolis."[5]

A few years later, a more famous and more flamboyant exile spoke of Siberia as a land blessed with "inexhaustible riches, boundless and yet-untapped forces ... and a great future." "Siberia," he declared, "can regenerate one." Thus Mixail Bakunin, in a letter from Tomsk.[6] Shortly afterwards, this time writing from Irkutsk, Bakunin waxed enthusiastic about the potentialities of Eastern Siberia under the "enlightened" rule of that ambitious proconsul, Murav'ëv-Amurskij. It seems that Murav'ëv's venture into the fertile Amur valley and his bid for independence from St. Petersburg bureaucracy—a tribute to the governor's power-drive rather than to his "liberalism"—had spurred Bakunin's vision of a prosperous and autonomous Siberia within the framework of a sprawling Slavic federation.

If, to a liberal or radical intelligent, Siberia was often a laboratory of social progress, a testing ground for his pet ideological schemes—be it independent farming or federalism—a somewhat less "committed" observer was more likely than not to be fascinated by the sheer sweep of the Siberian wilderness and awe-struck by the grandeur of its more impressive sights. One such observer was A. P. Čexov, who in 1890 journeyed across Siberia on his way to Sakhalin.[7]

Čexov's reaction to Siberia was not one of unalloyed delight. This vast and clearly heterogeneous region emerges from the writer's thoughtful reportage as a land of many contrasts. Traveling through Western Siberia, Čexov is impressed with the apparent honesty of the population: "... there is no stealing in these parts, not even at night."[8] At the same time he is discouraged by the alleged indications of "darkness," crudeness, and moral futility. "Here in Siberia," Čexov is told by a loquacious village barman Pëtr Petrovič, "people have dark minds. A Siberian is a good man, he is soft-hearted, he won't steal, he won't hurt anyone, he don't drink overmuch; a treasure, not a man. And yet he's just wasted, without doing any good to anyone. ... What does he live for?"[9]

It may be interposed here that the reliability of Pëtr Petrovič as a student of Siberian mores is never established in Čexov's narrative. Moreover, the "typical" Sibirjak who emerges from the barman's soliloquy looks very

much like yet another Čexov character. The fact remains that subsequently the author himself comments with considerable dismay on the oppressive dullness of both nature and man in Western Siberia.

The tenor of the travelogue changes drastically as soon as Čexov's coach reaches the shores of the turbulent Enisei River. The majestic beauty of this spectacle—apparently one of the most arresting in all of Russia—elicits from the restrained and sober Čexov a buoyantly optimistic prophecy: "On the banks of the Enisei life began with a moan, but it will end with such prowess as we haven't even dreamed of. ... As I stood on the banks of broad Enisei and looked eagerly at its waters, which rush toward the stern Arctic Ocean with terrible speed and force, I ... thought: what an ample, bold, intelligent life will one day brighten these shores!"[10]

Nor could the poet in Čexov remain indifferent to the wonder of the unknown, the unexplored. The sight of the impenetrable taiga launched Čexov on a flight of nearly Gogolian eloquence: "How many mysteries does the taiga conceal! ... Whither does this path lead? To a secret still? To a village, the existence of which is known neither to the police officer nor to the assessor? Or perhaps to a gold mine discovered by wandering prospectors? And what a captivating, devil-may-care freedom this enigmatic path breathes!"[11]

The contrast between the bleakness of the older—Western Siberian—settlements and the "captivating freedom" of the wilderness or, more broadly, between Siberia's predominantly drab social realities and the boundless promise of its "majestic Nature" is one of the principal themes in the work of the late-nineteenth-century Siberian poets.[12] A student of Russian poetry can safely ignore the meager output of Omulevskij, Monin, Mixeev, Semilužinskij, et al., well-meaning but pedestrian progeny of Nekrasov. But a cultural historian may well scrutinize their hackneyed rhetoric for the ideological leitmotifs of the emerging Siberian intelligentsia—the narodnik faith in the Russian peasant and the ardent, if somewhat ambivalent, regional patriotism. For these embattled "native sons" the notion of Siberia's "great destiny," which had already been articulated in varying keys by the Decembrists, by Bakunin, and by Čexov, becomes a basic article of faith.

Omulevskij, the best known (or should one say the least

obscure?) among the Sibirjak poets, envisions, in "A Happy Dream," the ultimate transformation of his native region from "a land of exile into that of free labor, where years of well-being had long erased all traces of suffering."[13] Apparently, "suffering" was still very much a part of Omulevskij's own life experience. In his grave civic verses "dreaming" or a fervent "belief" is time and again called upon to close the gap between the actual and the utopia: "I do not believe in dreams, but let these visions haunt me more often. Let me believe in my land the way children believe in their mother." "Your people is still asleep," we read elsewhere, "but in its youthful dreams the destiny of our native land appears dimly before its eye."[14]

In most of these outpourings the new Siberia "appears dimly" not as a natural outgrowth or culmination of the progress already made, but rather as a well-deserved, indeed an overdue reward for the hardships and heartaches which are still a sensitive Siberian's lot. Standing "on the top of the Urals," Mixeev contrasts the bracing atmosphere of the mountain peaks with the oppressive sadness of the plains and declares a bit stridently: "Let down there one's heart ache and one's soul be troubled; learn to breathe the way you do here: deeply and freely."[15] Once again the chasm between what is and what ought to be is to be bridged by an act of will, of an abiding faith in the liberating impact of Nature which sooner or later will "regenerate one."

The "up above" vs. "down below" dichotomy reappears in Siberian Themes by V. A. Monin.[16] This time, however, the distinction is drawn not between the grandeur of Nature and man's fumbling pursuits, but between the free Siberian settlement, humming with the energy and joy of work, and the dark "underground" of the Siberian mines: "The day dawns.... Throngs pour from Russia into Siberia.... Light, machines, telephones; trains puff, but from the ground groans are heard and the rattling of chains ..."[17] The Siberian penal system is stigmatized here as a grim anachronism, a dismal stain on what is increasingly a picture of vigorous and turbulent growth.

It may be a matter of some consequence that Monin's poem was written in 1911, i.e., toward the end of a period which witnessed a large-scale peasant migration to Siberia, spurred as it was by a more enlightened government policy and, needless to say, by the building of the Trans-Siberian

Railroad.[18] In other words, by 1911 some of Siberia's promises were already being fulfilled. Yet the bulk of Siberian poetry considered in this paper coincides with an earlier and a more precarious phase of that auspicious development. Hence, perhaps, the tendency shown by nearly all the poets under discussion to cast their more optimistic statements in the future tense. The Good Society, the fuller and freer life, implied in the positive image of Siberia, is seen here more often than not as a hope rather than a fulfillment, as a distant, if dimly perceptible, goal of a stubborn quest.

Let us take a look at Mixeev's poem "The New Settlers,"[19] a somewhat turgid description of a group of bedraggled and weary peasant migrants: "On dark, emaciated faces there was but one desire: to move along! ... dragging children, old women, the sick and the frail ... to move along and reach that which is beckoning from afar ... land neither ploughed nor measured. ... Land! land! It seemed that this word lay like a dream in the crease of each face, pensive and stern."

"And I was thinking," muses the author, "that there is no force stronger than this.... The ancestors' graves are powerless in the face of it.... Akin to faith in its firmness, to nature in its irrevocability, it will yet create men out of a people, and a people out of men."

The occasional awkwardness of phrasing should not prevent us from recognizing in the passages cited some of the emphases and attitudes usually associated with a so-called frontier outlook. What is especially worth noting is the characteristic, pioneer-type, time perspective. The past is viewed here not as a source of strength and of filial pride, a fountainhead of values—which is so often the case with older, tradition-bound communities—but as a hurdle to be gotten out of the way. In this scheme of things the present becomes the last phase of pre-history, an inevitably bleak prelude to the Brave New World. The accent—and the burden—is clearly on the future. It is the radiant Future, earned and prepared for by the past miseries and exertions, and yet marvelously discountinuous with them, that in retrospect is to confer meaning and justification upon the long and arduous journey to the promised land. It is the Future, vouchsafed by the endurance and resourcefulness of the pioneer as well as by the abundance and

splendor of his natural environment, that will see Omulevskij's "happy dream" come true and thus validate, in the words of a distinguished American historian, "the idealistic conception of the vacant lands as an opportunity for a new order of things."[20]

The vision outlined above found a more systematic and coherent expression in the emerging ideology of Siberian sectionalism (oblastničestvo), as reflected in the writings of Ščapov, Jadrincev, and Potanin. But the pioneering efforts of these earnest publicists and scholars deserve a separate treatment.

Notes

1. See Donald W. Treadgold, The Great Siberian Migration, to be published shortly by the University of Princeton Press.

2. One may note parenthetically that this situation did not prevent, indeed often encouraged, abuses of power on the part of local officialdom.

3. Zapiski dekabrista (Leipzig, 1870), p. 257.

4. Zapiski N. V. Basargina (Petrograd, 1917), p. 94.

5. I. I. Puščin, Zapiski o Puškine i pis'ma (Moskva, 1927), p. 15.

6. Steklov, M. A. Bakunin, I (Moskva, 1926-27), 490 (quoted in Svatikov, Rossija i Sibir' [Prague, 1929], p. 32).

7. "Across Siberia," The Unknown Chekhov (New York: Noonday Press, 1954), pp. 267-308.

8. Ibid., p. 280.

9. Ibid., p. 288.

10. Ibid., p. 304.

11. Ibid., p. 306.

12. Sibirskie motivy (S.-Peterburg, 1886); V. Mixeev, Pesni o Sibiri (Moskva, 1881); V. A. Monin, Sibirskie motivy (Berlin, 1921).

13. F. Omulevskii, "Ščastlivyj son," Sibirskie motivy, pp. 8-10.

14. "K Sibiri," Sibirskie motivy, p. 3.

15. See Pesni o Sibiri.

16. See above, note 12.

17. Sibirskie motivy, pp. 7-11.

18. Cf. Treadgold, op. cit.

19. "Novosëly," Pesni o Sibiri, p. 117.

20. F. J. Turner, The Frontier in American History (New York, 1920), p. 262.

DOSTOEVSKIJ AS A TRANSLATOR

By Noel Voge

University of California at Los Angeles

One of the first serious literary undertakings of the young Dostoevskij was his translation of Balzac's Eugénie Grandet. This was done during the Christmas holidays of 1843 and published the following summer in Nos. 6 and 7 of the St. Petersburg journal Repertuar i panteon, teatral'noe obozrenie. This work is usually given only cursory mention in works on Dostoevskij, apparently because of its dubious literary value. When mention is made, however, it is often inaccurate and seems to stem from a secondary source. Thus Blinoff,[1] Močul'skij,[2] Troyat,[3] and Levinson,[4] to mention some of the more recent studies, all remark that the translation was cut one third by the editor. This is the figure given by Grigorovič in his Literaturnye vospominanija.[5] Grigorovič, however, wrongly states that the translation was published in Biblioteka dlja čtenija. Futhermore, the above-mentioned studies all note that under the pen of Dostoevskij the sufferings of Eugénie become "terrible and profound" (Blinoff, p. 344; Troyat, p. 79; Močul'skij, p. 23; Levinson, pp. 77-78), and Močul'skij adds that Dostoevskij, "for some reason or other," compares Eugénie to a Greek statue, unaware of the fact that this comparison is in Balzac's own epilogue to the first edition of 1834, an epilogue not usually included in the later editions.

Grossman[6] has given a number of passages from the translation. He stresses the indebtedness of Dostoevskij to Balzac, reflections of which he sees both in abstractions such as Dostoevskij's long line of gentle, suffering women, as well as in such concrete items as the coins in the hoard of Gospodin Proxarčin.

The most complete study of Dostoevskij's translation to date is that of G. N. Pospelov.[7] Pospelov's work, however, suffers from the fact that he used a later edition of

Eugénie Grandet (1927) than did Dostoevskij, who, from very clear internal evidence, must have used the first edition of 1834. Thus a number of variants, which Pospelov considers willful, Dostoevskian mistranslations, are actually to be found in the original French.

Neither of the last two works mentioned gives much concern either to Dostoevskij's basic skill as a translator or to the problems inherent in translation from one culture to another. Except where noted, the present study is concerned primarily with aspects of the translation not discussed by Pospelov or Grossman.

Dostoevskij's translation has been printed at least three times in Russia, first in Repertuar i panteon, 1844, as mentioned above, in book form by A. E. Landau, St. Petersburg, 1883, and by G. G. Panteleev as Vol. IX of the collected works of Balzac, St. Petersburg, 1897. In Repertuar i panteon no mention of the translator is made; the Landau and Panteleev editions, however, are published simply as Perevod F. M. Dostoevskogo. The editor of Repertuar i panteon, on the other hand, introduces the translation with a prefatory note worth quoting in full:

> Èto odin iz pervyx i, bessporno, iz lučšix romanov plodovitogo Bal'zaka, kotoryj, v poslednee vremja, zametno ispisalsja. Skol'ko nam izvestno, roman ètot v russkom perevode napečatan ne byl, a potomu my nadeemsja ugodit' mnogim iz našix čitatelej, pomestiv ego v Repertuare i Panteone (6, 386).[8]

The first widespread error that needs correction is the statement that the translation was cut one-third by the editor. One-twentieth would be a closer figure. The only considerable abridgement is in the details of Grandet's financial manipulations, which certainly does the story no harm. Pospelov, oddly enough, attributes all the cuts to Dostoevskij. A number of the more serious mutilations may have been made by the censor or by Dostoevskij out of consideration for the censorship, for they are all items concerning the Church or morality. The most serious of these is the complete omission of Eugénie's stipulation concerning her marriage to Cruchot, namely that Cruchot will under no condition demand the consummation of that marriage. This omission robs Cruchot's counter-stipulation in the marriage contract of all its force. From the Russian

text the reader cannot know the reason for the clause inserted by Cruchot concerning the contingency of the death of either party in the absence of any children. Further omissions of this nature occur wherever Balzac displays his usual levity in matters concerning the Church: e.g., his statement that la grande Nanon was so pure that, when she should finally appear before God, (elle) devait comparaître...plus chaste que ne l'était la Vierge Marie elle-même (40);[9] Nanon's exclamation on seeing the green silk dressing gown of Charles Grandet: Sainte-Vierge! quel beau devant l'autel ça ferait pour la paroisse! (79); his comparison of Eugénie before and after falling in love to the the Holy Virgin before and after the conception (182); his remark concerning the death of the abbé, que Dieu eut la fantaisie d'appeler à lui (251).

Concerning the actual translation, two factors stand out. First of all, although Dostoevskij appears at least to have intended an exact, literal translation, the brilliant style of Balzac is by no means reproduced. Thus, as in many translations, the result can be compared to the design in a Turkish carpet as seen from the wrong side. In the second place, where Balzac is laconic, Dostoevskij is emotional. This is the heightening of the emotional content mentioned by Grossman, Pospelov, and others.

Dostoevskij is certainly attempting a literal, one might even say etymological, translation in rendering Papa Grandet's oath, par la serpette de mon père (192), as kljanus' serpom moego otca (7, 87). Russian serp, a sickle, is not quite the same thing as French serpette, a pruning knife, but each is intimately identified with the respective culture, and hence a logical object by which to swear. Similarly, where Balzac compares young Cruchot to the individus du genre dindon (227), Dostoevskij has odevalsja kak dendi (7, 111), convinced, perhaps, that English dandy is from French dinde or dindon.

Despite such attempts at perfect translation, however, Dostoevskij time after time fails to reproduce the subtlety and irony of Balzac. Thus when Grandet has decided for very material reasons to save the honor of his deceased brother, his notary Cruchot remarks: Notre vieil ami, qui a de l'honneur jusqu'au bout des ongles (140), and his banker des Grassins, not to be outdone, says: Grandet a de l'honneur jusqu'au bout des cheveux (141), Dostoevskij renders

the first as naš drug blagoroden i velikodušen (7, 53), and the second as naš drug Grandé česten, velikodušen (7, 54), which leaves the reader unaware not only of the humor of Balzac, but also of the rivalry, even in irony, between Cruchot and des Grassins. Similarly, throughout the whole novel Balzac repeatedly refers to Grandet as le bonhomme, which Dostoevskij translated variously as čudak, dobrjak, starik, or even skrjaga. And even though Balzac does state (124) that in Touraine, Poitou, Anjou, and Brittainy the appellation bonhomme may be given to anyone who has reached a certain age, no matter how cruel or kind he may indeed be, nevertheless the persistent use of the term can only imply irony, and the Russian terms do not do the original justice. Dostoevskij finally appears to prefer čudak, which is certainly far from bonhomme.

The problem here is one of equivalents. Russian society has simply not produced the equivalent of the French bonhomme. In this connection we note that Dostoevskij either attacks the idiom or evades it. For example, one does not build "castles in Spain" in Russia, hence Balzac's expression, où ils avaient bâti les châteaux en Espagne de leur joli ménage (182), becomes simply gde gadali o buduščem (7, 81). The same applies to proverbs, e.g., Hé, hé, ce pauvre Cornoiller, il vient comme marée en carême, est-ce bon à manger, ça? (129), which is rendered as A-a! nu, vot i naš Kornul'e! S dobyčej; družok? Čto-že èto vkusno, xorošo? a? (7, 46).

The list of weak translations is very long. The following examples are typical: Nanon, on being asked if she has hurt herself in falling down the stairs, answers: Non, puisque je me suis retenue en me fichant sur mes reins (46) — Net, ja uderžalas', sudarynja, ja ne upala (6, 405); further,

Les gens puissants veulent et veillent (124)	Mogučie xotjat i trudjatsja (1, 436)
—prêter les mains à un tripotage qui froissait les lois de la stricte probité (139)	—vdavat'sja v delo ne sovsem pravednoe (7, 53)

Dostoevskij also has great difficulty in reproducing Balzac's more complex analyses of his subject, e.g.,

Mais ne serait-ce pas qu'on omet presque toujours de	Pri bystryx, neobyknovennyx perevorotax sud'by

répandre sur nos déterminations spontanées une sorte de lumière psychologique, en n'explicant pas les raisons mystérieusement conçues qui les ont nécessitées? Peut-être la profonde passion d'Eugénie devrait-elle être analysée dans ses fibrilles les plus délicates; car elle devint, diraient quelques railleurs, une maladie, et influença toute son existence. Beaucoup de gens aiment mieux nier les dénouements, que de mesurer la force des liens, des noeuds, des attaches qui soudent secrètement un fait à un autre dans l'ordre moral. (121-2)

čelovečeskoj, issledovateli počti vsegda zabyvajut osvetit' nejasnuju storonu dela svetom fiziologii, t. e., ne razbirajut v podrobnosti pričin, zaključajuščixsja ne vo vnešnej prirode našej, a gluboko vo vnutrennej, duxovnoj. Možet byt', mučitel'naja strast' Evgenii dolžna byt' razobrana v svoix tončajšix fibrax i nitjax: ibo strast' èta, kak zametjat nekotorye, obratilas' v bolezn', otravivšuju vse suščestvovanie devuški. No mnogie issledovateli ljubjat lučše otreč'sja ot suščestvovanija dela, čem trudit'sja, analiziruja ego, rasputyvaja zaputannye uzly i svjazyvaja porvannye koncy proisšestvij. (6, 454)

First of all, the rendering of lumière psychologique by svetom fiziologii is probably a typographical error. Note, however, the difficulty Dostoevskij has in translation déterminations spontanées, raisons mystérieusement conçues, or dénouements. His circumlocutions do not do the original justice.

A passage such as the above brings up the other point of this inquiry, Dostoevskij's willful subjective rendering of Balzac. Note that in the foregoing passage the word railleurs is not translated and the profonde passion of Eugénie has become a mučitel'naja strast'. Furthermore, in the French (but only according to certain scoffers) this passion had become a malady which influenced her whole existence, whereas in the Russian it poisoned this existence. In this respect one of the most Dostoevskian is the rendering of Eugénie's farewell letter to Charles, in which she admonishes him: Soyez heureux, selon les conventions sociales auxquelles vous sacrifiez nos premières amours (247) — Itak bud'te sčastlivy pod gnetom cepej, dobrovol'no vami na sebja nalagaemyx (7, 122). The "social conventions" have become "chains which oppress."

This is the main burden of Pospelov's study. He points out that at nearly every possible step Dostoevskij has

heightened the pathos, usually either by means of tautological additions or by the use of words with far greater emotional content. The following are typical examples mentioned by him. (Additions by Dostoevskij are enclosed in parentheses.)

Mais la femme demeure, elle reste face à face avec le chagrin dont rien la ne distrait (181)	No čem rasseet, (čem razgonit) ženščina svoe gore? Ono pered neju vsegda, (za neju povsjudu, neizmennoe, beznadežnoe, užasnoe) (7, 80)
L'Histoire de France est là tout entière (18)	Slovom, najdete vse: istoriju, (letopisi, predanija) (6, 387)
Sous le Consulat le bonhomme Grandet devint maire (22)	Nastupila èpoxa konsul'stva. Počtennyj, (uvažaemyj) Grandé byl sdelan merom (6, 390)
—il ouvrait la gueule de sa bourse (25)	—on rastjagival (užasnuju) past' košelja svoego (6, 391)

Note particularly the type of epithets employed at the very opening of the novel:

Dans certaines provinces se trouvent des maisons dont la vue inspire une mélancolie égale à celle que provoquent les cloîtres les plus sombres, les landes les plus ternes ou les ruines les plus tristes. (17)	Inogda v provincii vstrečaeš' žiliščа, s vidu (mračnye) i unylye, kak drevnie monastyri, kak (dikie) grustnye razvaliny, kak suxie, (besplodnye, obnažennye) stepi; (6, 386)

A number of Pospelov's conclusions are faulty, however, for the simple reason that he used a later edition of Eugénie Grandet. Thus, for example, when Balzac has Eugénie wonder if Charles, off in India, still thinks of her when seeing a certain star, and Dostoevskij has for star oblačko (7, 81), Pospelov (p. 132) attributes this to a sentimental motivation in Dostoevskij. Actually, the 1834 edition has en voyant les nuages (182). Similarly, Pospelov (p. 122) wrongly attributes to Dostoevskij the simile according to which Charles Grandet faces the possible fate of a snail which has stumbled into a beehive. This is found in both the 1834 and 1843 editions of Eugénie Grandet (74).

There is, however, a tendency in some of the renderings

which Pospelov does not mention; this is Dostoevskij's apparent urge to suggest a wretchedness not found in Balzac. Thus when Balzac has Grandet acquire property during the revolution by bribing with 200 double louis the farouche républicain qui surveillait la vente des domaines nationaux (22), Dostoevskij has sunuv oborvannomu sankjulotu zolotuju vzjatku v 200 luidorov (6, 389). The metamorphosis from a farouche républicain to an oborvannyj sankjulot is singularly Dostoevskian. Similarly, when Grandet shows his nephew Charles the room in which he is to stay while visiting, he states simply and unemotionally: Vous voilà chez vous, mon neveu (78). This Dostoevsky renders as: Nu, vot i tvoja norka (6, 425), and in the word norka we see the spirit of Makar Devuškin already haunting this stronghold of the bourgeoisie in Saumur.

Dostoevskij apparently also felt that the stereotyped view of French wickedness could be underlined more strongly than it is in Balzac. Thus when Mme. des Grassins is discussing local mores with the abbé she exclaims at one point: Fi! Cela est digne de Faublas, to which the abbé replies: Vous avez donc lu Faublas? (73). Dostoevskij translates this simple query as Tak vy čitali i Foblaza, skazal abbat sladkim golosom (6, 422). The French text calls for no "sweet voice." Similarly, when Charles Grandet is assessing Mme. des Grassins, Balzac has a simple, bald statement: Elle est très-bien, cette femme, se dit en lui-même Charles Grandet, en répondant aux minauderies de madame des Grassins (66). Dostoevskij renders this in a different tone: Da èto klad, podumal Šarl', smotrja na gospožu de Grassen: nu, kto-by mog predpolagat'? (6, 417). Dostoevskij's Charles Grandet is much more of a rake than is Balzac's original.

In translating there will inevitably arise difficulties inherent in the peculiarities of the respective languages and cultures. As mentioned above, the images called forth by bonhomme or châteaux en Espagne, have no equivalent in Russian. This is the real test of the translator. There is, for example, no good Russian equivalent for the title of address mademoiselle. With one exception, Balzac applies this term to his heroine only after the death of her father, perhaps to underline the dignity of her new position in society. Only once does Dostoevskij attempt a translation, devica Grandé (7, 110); elsewhere he adheres to the heroine's

Christian name, as before, or evades the issue completely, e.g., Mademoiselle Grandet eût ainsi quatre serviteurs (224)—Itak v dome bylo četvero slug (7, 109). One way out of this difficulty is to apply, where possible, the foreign word. Dostoevskij does a minimum of this, and the few French words that do appear in the translation, some in russified forms, are certainly not his innovations, e.g., su, ekju, frank, luidor, deviz, ferma, kuzen, kuzina, mer, sankjulot, grizetka. This last word is for ouvrière in the original. At times the equivalents are quite fortunate, e.g., stepi (6, 386) for les landes (17). At other times he overcompensates in his desire to make an image familiar to Russians; Balzac has only to say demain il pleut (178) for Dostoevskij to evoke one of his favorite views of nature in St. Petersburg: na-zavtra dožd', na dvore grjaz' i sljakot' (7, 77).

In this connection certain non-verbal expressions are worth mentioning. One of Papa Grandet's gestures, for example, is described as follows: Pas seulement ça! dit-il en faisant claquer l'ongle de son pouce sous sa maitresse dent (193), for which Dostoevskij attempts a Russian equivalent: Vot, skol'ko ne podarju, skazal on, pokazyvaja samuju malen'kuju čast' na svoem mizince (7, 87).

The list of examples could be extended to include practically every sentence of the original. Those cited, however, are quite sufficient to point to certain definite conclusions. The first of these is that the translation does not do justice to the French original. It is on the whole weak and often clumsy. It fails to reproduce the economical style and laconic wit of the author. The other is that although, as Grossman states, Dostoevskij was certainly drawn to Balzac as to a related genius (vlečenie k rodstvennomu geniju),[10] one can scarcely, in view of the manner with which Dostoevskij completely distorts the style of Balzac, agree with Grossman's further statement that this translation served as a literary school for Dostoevskij in molding his own literary approach. Pospelov (p. 117) is closer to the truth in noting that Dostoevskij's style had already crystalized, for the time being at least, into that of the Russian natural school. Rather than the creator of the unforgettable Papa Grandet we find the creator of Makar Devuškin and Varvara Dobroselova.

Notes

1. Marthe Blinoff, "Dostoïevski et Balzac," Comparative Literature, III (1951), 344.

2. Konstantin Močul'skij, Dostoevskij (Paris, 1947), p. 23.

3. Henri Troyat, Dostoievsky (Paris, 1940), p. 79.

4. Jules Levinson, La vie pathétique de Dostoievsky (Paris, 1931), pp. 77-78.

5. D. V. Grigorovič, "Literaturnye vospominanija," Polnoe sobranie sočinenij (S.-Peterburg, 1896), XII, 270.

6. Leonid Grossman, "Tvorčestvo Dostoevskogo," Sobranie sočinenij v pjati tomax (Moskva, 1928), II, ii, 79.

7. G. N. Pospelov, " 'Eugénie Grandet' Bal'zaka v perevode F. M. Dostoevskogo," RANIION, Institut jazyka i literatury, Učenye zapiski, II (1928), 103-136.

8. References are to book and page of Repertuar i panteon. It so happens that book 6 is in vol. VI and book 7 in vol. VII, 1844.

9. References are to the Bibliotheca Romanica edition of Eugénie Grandet (Strasbourg, 1909). This edition gives the original readings of the 1834 Paris edition.

10. Grossman, p. 77.

DAŠA ČUMALOVA AND HER SUCCESSORS

By Xenia Gąsiorowska

University of Wisconsin

I

Gladkov's Cement, written in the eventful years 1922-24, is a Soviet classic. It has the distinction of being the first novel dealing with the task of "socialist reconstruction," of introducing a true proletarian hero and heroine, and of stating the problems of the newly emancipated Russian women.

Gleb Čumalov and Daša, his wife, are model Communists, at least according to the standards of the 1920's: in the novel they pass with flying colors the test of a drastic Party "purge." Gleb, returning home from war, immediately channels his military zeal and courage into the field of peaceful reconstruction, as will innumerable Soviet literary heroes after him. His efforts to rebuild the cement factory constitute one of the twin plots of the novel. The other plot, which also became a standard pattern in Soviet literature, features the marital difficulties of the Čumalovs, resulting from the fact of Daša's having spiritually grown in the bleak war years while Gleb apparently has not.[1]

Estrangement follows, and finally Daša moves out of her ruined home to dedicate her life to serving the new society. She leaves behind her baffled and sorrowful husband and the grave of their little daughter, Njurka, who died at an orphanage where she had been put by her mother at the start of the latter's emancipation from the old order.

The significant changes in the treatment of the questions of family, morals, and a woman's place in society, which occurred in the thirty years following the appearance of Cement, are of interest and deserve closer attention.[2]

II

In the Čumalovs' marital conflict the sympathies of the author and the critics were, in the 1920's, on Daša's side.

True, she neglected all her duties as wife, homemaker, and mother, and sinned against established canons of chastity, fidelity, and devotion to her husband. But it was the completeness, the thoroughness of her breach of the centuries-old tradition, the uncompromising destruction of the pre-revolutionary order of family life, which recommended her as the new woman to the eager followers of the "new." It is, however, interesting to note that the contemporary critical discussion of Cement concentrated on Gleb: his communist prowess and—this notwithstanding—his failure to accept the "new" Daša, rather than on Daša herself. The reason for this seems to be that it was easier to censure the shortcomings of the bourgeois family, marriage, and mentality which should be abolished than to find a workable solution for problems arising in setting up the new, proletarian set of values. Cement showed the way to destroy the "old"; building the "new" was a wholly different matter.

> "True, Gleb, I am different now. No longer a homemaker."
> "Well, that's what I am saying!"
> "And that home of ours I've forgotten. And I have no regrets. I was just a little fool in those days."
> "What the hell! And where is our home to be now?"
> She looked at him steadfastly:
> "So you want flowers on the window sill and a bed bursting with soft pillows? No, Gleb. In winter I live in an unheated room (there's a fuel crisis, you should know), and I eat my meals in the communal kitchen. Don't you see: I am a free Soviet citizen."
>
> Fear flashed in his eyes, which had seen blood and death. A devil of a woman! One had to find some other way of treating her.[3]

The critics, dismissing in a few reluctant remarks Daša's extra-marital affairs and the death of her abandoned Njurka, explain: "It is hard for Gleb to accept Daša's point of view, a very difficult one for a man brought up in the principles of the older morality and psychology."[4] "Only through Daša's stubborn resistance, through his own deep internal struggle, through painful effort does Gleb shed the ancient Adam lingering in his soul."[5] "Their first misunderstanding arises because of Gleb's possessive attitude toward the woman."[6] One of the less enthusiastic critics admits that "Gladkov imagined a heroic woman who decided

once and for all to free herself from male tyranny in order to live henceforth free and independent for the welfare of the collective ... : in real life the matter is much more complicated."[7]

It was. The problem was real and urgent and the situation chaotic. That the bourgeois form of family life was to be abolished simultaneously with the abolition of capitalism was plainly stated in the Communist Manifesto.[8] That the domination of man in marriage, being a simple consequence of his economic domination, would vanish once woman would begin to earn her living as a free citizen in a classless society—was guaranteed by Engels.[9] That merely legal measures would not assure women real freedom as long as they continue to be "domestic slaves crushed, strangled, degraded, and stultified by petty housework in the kitchen and the nursery" was recognized by Lenin.[10] But the practical realization of all these principles amid the political turmoil, economic hardships, and social upheaval of the New Economic Policy period were beyond the capacities of the fictional Dašas and their living prototypes.

Aleksandra Kollontaj, the ardent pioneer of women's rights, painted a radiant vision of the new heroine, self-supporting, living alone, doing social or political work, and "wrestling from life small earthly joys of physical love."[11] She showed her eating her meals at the communal kitchen, her children happy in the charge of the well-trained staff of State nurseries and kindergartens, her home tidied by State-provided workers, her laundry done, and her clothes repaired in special Government-run institutions.[12] But in the meantime Cement shows a different picture:

> Gleb never came home during the day: this desolate room with its dusty windows—not even flies ever buzzed against the panes—its unwashed floor and the heap of ragged clothing, was unfamiliar and stuffy, the walls seemed to close on him ... he would return home by night but Daša was not there to meet him on the threshold as she did three years ago.... She came after midnight ... not the former Daša, that one was dead ... undressed standing by the table, munching a crust of the rationed bread, not looking in his direction. Her face was tired and stern.[13]

And, even worse:

> The children's home was there in the mountain gorge among clumps of trees ... among the bushes,... Gleb saw children ... prowling, digging hurriedly, greedily, watchful as thieves ... snatching their "finds" from each other ... digging in the manure.... "But these poor brats are starving, Daša! ... Is Njurka—does our Njurka, too?" ... [Dasha shrugged] "Why should Njurka be any different? She had her rough times too. If it were not for our women, kids would have perished from lice, and disease, and starvation."[14]

Lenin was indignant at proletarian women who attached an exaggerated importance to matters of sex and marriage in those days of threatening counter-revolution.[15] Soviet psychologists warned that "the collective should attract [a class-conscious proletarian] more joyfully, more strongly than a love partner."[16] But poor Daša sighed: "Everything has become torn and tangled. Love must be built in some new manner."[17]

Love, inside and outside wedlock, was not her only problem. It was, of course, one of her newly acquired rights. Freedom from household drudgery was the second. But the third, that of doing important things outside the home, was closely linked to the equally new and paramount duty: serving society. It was this combined aspect of the "new," its challenge, its appeal, that was to determine henceforth the fortunes of the new Soviet heroine.

Whatever her shortcomings, Daša is a pioneer. Unquestionably she is given to drastic measures, to exaggeration; she shows off. Much of it, however, stems from the desire to prove to herself, more than to others, that she really is a new woman, a worthy dweller in the Promised Land of freedom. It must have hurt to let her geraniums wither unwatered on a dusty window sill, to see her child die for want of love and care, to repulse Gleb, whom she never had ceased to love. Even her promiscuity is a form of defiance, of breaking established norms. She plunges into work—unpaid, demanding, exhausting work—with the fervor of a settler felling the forest for his future home. She is the best worker of the ženotdel,[18] she speaks at meetings, organizes children's homes and community kitchens, risks her life foraging in the villages for food for these institutions.

Daša has no education and, except in matters of politics,

strives for none. If she ever had had a religion, she must have left it somewhere along the road she took after walking out of her home. She lives in the present, groping for the future only in that she destroys the past.

III

Thirty years after Cement a reviewer of The Drivers[19] —a novel typical of the standardized post-war series dedicated to the "builders of socialism"—makes a metaphorical comment on the progress achieved by the Soviet regime:

> These descriptions of speeding trucks driven by the conquerors of time and space stylistically recall the author's remote kinship with the classic realists, particularly with Gogol', but what a difference between the great creator of Dead Souls and a socialist realist of today! The former, carried away in Čičikov's troika, sighs melancholically: "Whither fliest thou, Russia? Answer! There is no answer"—whereas the Soviet drivers know perfectly well where they are flying: their goal is clearly set, their time exactly planned—they will arrive at their destination not a minute late![20]

This attitude—boasting, energetic, assured (or is it reassuring?)—keynotes the novels dealing with marital and family problems of the contemporary fictional heroines, the Dašas of World War II.

The plots of these novels follow the pattern of Cement: the couple's war-time separation, the wife's emancipation from the home, the husband's resentment, and the ensuing conflict. Yet, in spite of the similarity of situations, of emotional problems, and even of detail, the difference is striking: it is the spirit of the time that has changed. Daša's story ends on the tragic note of an unsolvable dilemma; those of her daughters, on a "they lived happily for ever after" tone. And the happy ending is meant to drive home the point which made it possible: Soviet Russia's troika, it is understood, knows exactly where it is flying and under the Party's guidance will get there on time.

The nature of the change is currently expressed in a Party pronouncement significantly entitled: "'Let Us Unceasingly educate the Soviet People in the Spirit of Communist Morality."

> In our country—within the process of building socialism and because of woman's complete equality in every aspect of economic, political, and cultural life—a new family has come into existence, a new way of life reflecting the comradeship in work and the socialist spirit of mutual help which constitute the foundations of Soviet society.... Fighting for a healthy way of life, for the establishment of family relationships in the spirit of Communist morality, is an integral part of Party work.[21]

The new family, then, differs from that of the 1920's primarily in that its importance is recognized, indeed exalted. It is, it seems, an edifice built on the site of the one Daša helped so wholeheartedly to wreck. Resting on "the bedrock foundations of Soviet society,"[22] cemented by "the organizing power of work,"[23] it is, moreover, protected from ill weather by the vigilance of the Party. And woman's role in it is one of paramount importance.

For an analysis of the manner in which Daša's problems are handled by her successors, we will choose three representative novels: G. Medyn'skij's Mar'ja (1949), E. Mal'cev's Heart and Soul (1948),[24] and G. Nikolaeva's The Harvest (1950).[25] The latter two were winners of the Stalin literary award in their respective years of appearance.

The heroines of all the three novels are peasant women chosen here because 1) their educational level and mode of life are nearer to Daša's than would be those of a factory worker today; 2) the kolkhoz background offers a broader field for individual achievement for a housewife than does the city; 3) postwar industrial novels feature heroes rather than heroines, and in these industrial novels the center of the stage is occupied by partorgs to the exclusion of workers, a fact which has caused some resentment among critics.[26]

It should not be overlooked that, whereas Cement endeavored to present a problem but not to solve it, the novels written under socialist realism attempt to provide an answer to what allegedly has ceased to be a problem. They actually aim at setting up a model of correct behavior for married couples. But then, Russian literature of the 1920's did not claim the right and duty of educating its readers.

IV

War separates Rodion and Grunja Vasilcev, the

principal characters of Heart and Soul, three days after their wedding, and a few months later the bride hears that Rodion has died at the front. Work in the kolkhoz is Grunja's only solace; soon she earns the reputation of a talented agriculturist. When Rodion returns (wounded—he was rescued by partisans), he resents her authority, misunderstands her intentions when she offers advice in his work, envies her success. Hurt, she leaves him, but returns when he realizes his error, and from then on they work happily together, encouraged by a Party secretary who is in love with Grunja but who hides his feelings.

> In their conflict [remarks a critic] are best shown the new qualities of Soviet morality.... Love does not suffice to create a strong new family: there must be community of ideals, a common goal in life.[27]

In our second novel, Mar'ja, war takes the heroine's whole family away from her. Simon, her husband, and her young son are both called into the army, and soon both are reported killed; her teen-age daughter leaves to work in a munitions factory. Mar'ja is elected chairman of her kolkhoz and, in spite of difficult war-time conditions, does an excellent job. When Simon, mistakenly reported dead, returns, he demands that Mar'ja resign: people refer to him as "Mar'ja's husband," and her work keeps her away from home chores which fall in part to Simon. Also, he is jealous of Mar'ja's friendship with an MTS mechanic. A wise Party secretary averts the impending tragedy:

> "He used to be everything, the boss [Maria complains], and I? Nobody! I had no mind of my own, that's why he loved me. But during the war ... I carried a great work on my shoulders, one that opened my eyes, broadened my mind. My soul opened, I want to go forward ... and he does not like that."
> "Who doesn't? A Soviet soldier? A partisan?"—asked Ivan Il'ič. "Perhaps you have not been handling him properly. All right, you want to go forward, but why should he stay behind?"
> "I don't want that, either! What kind of man would he be?"
> "You see," smiled Ivan Il'ič, "you have nothing to quarrel about. You're just mixed up!"[28]

Simon is soon awarded the title of a Hero of Socialist Labor for setting a record in wheat production, and husband and wife settle down to a life of mutual appreciation, love, and common work.

In the Harvest, Vasilij Bortnikov, mistakenly reported killed in action, returns home to find his wife, Dunja, married to Stepan. For the sake of the two Bortnikov children it is agreed that Vasilij is to forgive and forget, Stepan to leave, and Dunja—though not consulted—to accept the situation. Vasilij, a Communist, at once becomes active in the reconstruction of the war-ruined kolkhoz, and is amazed to discover that his quiet homemaker Dunja is holding a responsible position there. He protests when Dunja enrolls in a course in animal husbandry in a distant town. Finally, hurt by his old-fashioned masterful attitudes, she decides to leave him, at least for the time being:

> "We have to live apart for a while, Vasja, to think, to consider. I am not making any decisions concerning our future. Perhaps a time will come when we will find different words to say to each other, perhaps a new way. I don't know, but this I do know: I cannot live the way we do now."[29]

After a while Bortnikov falls victim to a plot organized by local villains, and Dunja, helped by an understanding Party secretary, comes to his rescue. She finds him at their deserted home, resembling that of the Čumalovs.

> Neglect, loneliness, a bleak silence greeted her in the rooms, once cosy and filled with the sound of children's voices. Untended geraniums had withered on the window sills, a blanket tossed across the bed failed to conceal torn sheets.[30]

They make up and build a life full of mutual respect, understanding, and of useful work for the community. In the words of a critic:

> Socialist consciousness, Party unity, community of interests ... this is what determines their relationship, and this is that new element which did not and could not exist in the past.[31]

V

How does the postwar emancipated woman's position differ from Daša's? In the first place, the element of

uncertainty, of guessing, of groping for the proper line of behavior, is eliminated: a Soviet woman's equal rights are firmly established and in the event that they conflict with those of her husband's a Party official is always on hand to arbitrate. Secondly, such an intense rebellious spirit is no longer necessary: a husband who objects to a wife's enthusiastic absorption in outside interests is simply unreasonable and ridiculously behind the times—almost as a pre-revolutionary husband would be in insisting that his wife live in a terem.[32] Then, the outside activities taking the wife away from her home duties have become less dramatic: Daša's work consisted of political propaganda and of the forced requisition of goods from the "enemies of the People," while the three postwar housewives are simply engaged in building socialism through increased production. They participate in a routine, organized, collective effort. Also, they have an additional outlet for ambition—education, which ranges from semi-literate Mar'ja's reading fiction to Dunja's studying technical agricultural literature. It is worth noting that the fields of achievement and social usefulness are today readily accessible to these average citizens: all three women are admitted to candidacy in the Communist Party only as a crowning result of their efficient work and after a suitable initiation in the rudiments of Communist ideology. Daša, on the other hand, begins by joining the Party and then, in her capacity as a member, works and fights, and studies the writings of the fathers of the movement in her few spare moments.

Lastly, free love, as understood by Kollontaj and her followers in the twenties, is completely discredited. A modern Soviet heroine may leave her husband if he stands in the way of her freedom, but no love out of wedlock is permitted. Dunja marries Stepan after a chaste courtship; Grunja does not even consider a possibility of a love affair with the Party secretary, and Mar'ja's relationship with her mechanic is based on comradeship alone.

As to children—these heirs to the conquests made by the Revolution[33]—their place in the family is near the hearth. Modern women do not have to face Daša's heartbreaking choice between motherhood and social service. The promised children's palaces have not as yet materialized even in "varnished" fiction,[34] but there are nurseries and kindergartens to assist working mothers, and grandma

—the time-honored traditional baby-sitter—helps out to a considerable degree.

A new development—too new as yet to permit critical evaluation—is discernible in the plot of a recent novel, Useless Fame[35] by S. Voronin (1955). There Katja Lukonina, having achieved fame as an exceedingly thorough and dedicated dairymaid, is promoted to chairman of her kolkhoz and almost ruins it by her inefficient management, her refusal to consult the collective, and generally by having become "dizzy with success" and acting as a spoiled prima donna. Had she listened to her husband who understands her limitations and is ready with advice (for once the Party secretary proves to be inadequate!) all would have been well. She, however, insists on using her own judgment and in consequence is left to deal with her growing administrative troubles alone: her husband leaves her. This is an unusual denouement since no husband, except a villain, had ever left a distinguished wife in Soviet fiction.

VI

In spite of physical hardships, personal tragedy, and the horrors of civil war, Daša could sense the majestic swing of the historic pendulum and participated in the romantic ardor of the revolution. Njurka's generation follows a beaten track, paved with drab, petty difficulties, and small, tame successes. Amply provided with instructions, relieved from responsibilities, deprived of initiative, these women may, notwithstanding, claim to be equal to their menfolk in every respect. Their rights and duties are regulated by the same authority; they, too, earn their bread in the sweat of their brow. Law and social opinion stand guard against marital tyranny, while press, radio, and fiction tirelessly, even monotonously, assure them that they are the freest and consequently the happiest women in the whole world.

From the distant Cement, the romantic, reckless, obstinate Daša, her hair bobbed and tied with a red kerchief in token of her pioneering status, questions the pert, overalls-clad Njura of The Drivers: "Whither fliest thou? Answer!"[36]

Notes

1. F. Abramov, "Ljudi kolxoznoj derevni v poslevoennoj proze," Novyj Mir (April 1954), p. 224.

2. It should be noted that changes occurring during this period in the characterization of fictional heroines have been completely geared to current demands of Soviet literary policies. In compliance with these demands Gladkov revised Cement before each of its numerous editions (most important changes: 1934 and 1948). The revising primarily consisted in the improvement of Gladkov's early flamboyant style as well as in adjusting the novel ideologically to the changes within the Communist Party. Neither the Čumalovs' marital conflict nor Daša's emancipated behavior was affected in the process. Still, since at different periods stylistic re-touching made Daša appear mellower or sterner (she also reappears as a secondary character in Energy [1937], as a Red Army commissar), quotations in this article are from the original magazine version of Cement (Krasnaja Nov', 1925).

3. F. Gladkov, Cement (Krasnaja Nov', Nos. 1-6, January-August 1925), No. 1, p. 87.

4. E. Nikitina, Belletristy sovremenniki, Vol. II (Moskva, 1929), p. 53.

5. A. Gorbov, "Itogi literaturnogo goda," Novyj Mir (December 1925), p. 132.

6. M. Maizel', "F. Gladkov," Zvezda (April 1926), p. 230.

7. O. M. Brik, "Počemu ponravilsja Cement," in N. F. Čužak, ed., Literatura fakta (Moskva, 1929), p. 86.

8. The Communist Manifesto (London, 1948), p. 147.

9. F. Engels, Der Ursprung der Familie, des Privateigenthums und des Staats (Stuttgart, 1920), p. 72..

10. V. I. Lenin, Sochinenija, XXIV (Moskva, 1935), 343.

11. A. Kollontaj, Novaja moral' i rabochij klass (Moskva, 1919), p. 7.

12. A. Kollontaj, Sem'ja i kommunističeskoe gosudarstvo (Moskva, 1918), pp. 13-19.

13. Gladkov, No. 1, p. 86.

14. Ibid., pp. 92-93.

15. C. Zetkin, Lenin on the Woman Question (New York, n.d.), p. 8.

16. A. Zalkind, Polovoj vopros v usloviax sovetskoj obščestvennosti (Leningrad, 1926), p. 13.

17. Gladkov, No. 6, p. 60.

18. Special Party branch dedicated to women's affairs.

19. A. Rybakov, Voditeli (Moskva, 1951).

20. A. Upit, "Roman A. Rybakova, Voditeli," Oktjabr' (March 1951), p. 184.

21. Editorial: "Neustanno vospityvat' sovetskix ludej v duxe kommunističeskoj morali," Kommunist, No. 13 (September 1954), p. 9.

22. Ju. Konstantinov, "Sila sovetskoj sem'i," Zvezda (November 1950), p. 184.

23. N. Kalitin, "Trud preobražajuščij žizn'," Zvezda (December 1950), p. 160.

24. Ot vsego serdca.

25. Žatva.

26. P. Dombrovskij, "Roman o našix sovremennikax," Zvezda (February 1953), p. 174.

27. A. Belik, "Ljudi novoj derevni," Znamja (March 1949), p. 179.

28. Ibid., p. 285.

29. Ibid., p. 202.

30. Ibid., p. 379.

31. M. Essen, "O romane Žatva," Oktjabr' (November 1950), p. 172.

32. Women's secluded section in a pre-Petrine house.

33. Z. Guseva, "Dve formy sem'i, dva ponimanija nravstvennosti," Oktjabr' (July 1949), p. 173.

34. Lakirovka, a term used in Soviet literary criticism to designate the beautified presentation of Soviet reality prevalent in socialist realism fiction.

35. Nenužnaja slava.

36. The preparation of this paper was made possible, in part, through a research grant to the writer from the University of Wisconsin.

SLAVIC LINGUISTICS IN TODAY'S YUGOSLAVIA

By Alexander M. Schenker

Yale University

The state of Slavic studies in today's Yugoslavia can be briefly characterized by several general remarks.[1] One is struck first of all by the neo-grammarian approach of the great majority of Yugoslav scholars towards linguistic analysis. The lack of first-hand acquaintance with the aims and methods of the structuralists can only partly be explained by the difficulties in obtaining books from abroad. Except for a few younger Slavists, one finds that the prevailing attitude towards the recent developments in Western linguistics is one of unawareness and indifference.

In the second place, as far as the direction of linguistic studies is concerned, one finds considerable interest in the languages of the Federation and in Old Church Slavic to the virtual exclusion of other Slavic languages. This seemingly provincial attitude becomes understandable when we recall the degree of political and cultural isolation imposed on Yugoslavia by other Slavic countries until very recent times.

Thirdly, it is evident that of all branches of linguistic science, it is the lexicography and dialectology which are favored by Yugoslav scholars and in which the most significant achievements have been gained.

Linguistic research is centered in the university towns: Belgrade, Zagreb, Ljubljana, Skopje, Novi Sad, and Sarajevo. Of these the first three are by far the most important. They are the seats of the Serbian, Yugoslav, and Slovenian Academies respectively, and boast a long and rich linguistic tradition symbolized by the distinguished scholars Aleksandar Belić in Belgrade, Stjepan Ivšić in Zagreb, and Rajko Nahtigal in Ljubljana.

In the following report the recent developments in Slavic studies will be discussed by topics, starting with those which were mentioned above.

Lexicography in Yugoslavia got off to a brilliant start

when, in the beginning of the nineteenth century, Vuk Karadžić published his famous Lexicon. Today, as for the last odd seventy-five years, the greatest undertaking of Yugoslav and, for that matter, Slavic lexicography is Rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika published by the Yugoslav Academy of Zagreb. The dictionary, started in 1880 by Djuro Daničić, was from the beginning planned on a grandiose scale. Based on historical principles, it covers all of the Serbo-Croatian literature up to Vuk. It shows the accents of all entries, provides many quotations to illustrate the usage, includes material on place and personal names, and, in many cases, gives cognates from other Slavic languages. Under the editorship of Tomo Maretić the basic principles were slightly modified, mainly in the direction of economy of space and of speeding up the work. Interrupted by the war, the publication was resumed immediately after the liberation, and the dictionary has since been coming out at regular and comparatively short intervals. Its present editor Stjepan Musulin hopes that the whole dictionary will be completed in four or five years.

Another large dictionary, which is meant to supplement the former, is the dictionary currently being prepared by the Serbian Academy in Belgrade. This dictionary will draw material from the Serbo-Croatian literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, starting with the language of Dositej Obradović and going up to as far as 1950. It represents actually a continuation of the work on a dictionary of modern Serbo-Croatian started at the end of the last century by Stojan Novaković. Since then five million slips have been collected, and during the occupation the first, trial, fascicle came out. The preparatory work has now reached the letter K and the first fascicle containing A and B should come out soon. Belić is its editor-in-chief.

A short dictionary of modern Serbo-Croatian, something on the order of Ušakov for Russian, is being prepared by both Matica Srpska and Matica Hrvatska. It will come out in two versions, in the Cyrillic and Latin alphabets, published at the same time in Novi Sad and Zagreb, respectively. It is supposed to incorporate the spelling reform now being discussed in Yugoslavia.

Slovenia and Macedonia are also active in lexicographic work. In Ljubljana the Academy is preparing a dictionary of contemporary literary Slovenian, scheduled for

completion in ten years. It will replace the very good but dated dictionary of Pleteršnik. Also in Ljubljana a big historical dictionary of Slovenian is in preparation. In 1950 an excellent Slovenski pravopis was published by the Slovenian Academy. In Skopje a comprehensive dictionary of Macedonian is contained in Grammar of the Macedonian Literary Language by Horace G. Lunt.

A glance at the dialect map of Yugoslavia will suffice to make clear the fascination that dialectological studies hold for Yugoslav linguists. The most interesting dialectological work on the territory of Serbo-Croatian is that of Pavle Ivić, one of the ablest young Yugoslav Slavists, known to the American reader from his article on the present state of the study of standard Macedonian (Slavic Word, II, 325-338). Ivić has studied the dialects of Banat, the language of Serbian settlers in eastern Macedonia, the so-called Gallipoli Serbs, and, most recently, the dialects of Serbian villages in Rumania. Under Ivić's direction Matica Srpska is preparing an atlas of Serbian dialects as an introductory step to the compilation of a big atlas embracing all of Yugoslavia. The only post-war issue of Srpski dijalektološki zbornik contains two long studies: a description of the dialect of Djakovica, a town on the Serbo-Albanian frontier, by Stevanović and a description of the dialect of the island Korčula in the čakavian territory, by Moskovljević. Zagreb, traditionally interested in the čakavian area, is also contributing to the study of those dialects. The most active investigator there is Mate Hraste who specializes in the speech of the Dalmatian islands. Hraste is also instrumental in the creation of a new serial publication of the Yugoslav Academy called Hrvatski dijalektološki zbornik. Its first issue contains among others an important study of the dialect of the island of Susak by Hamm, Hraste, and Guberina and a very useful bibliography of Serbo-Croatian dialectology and onomastics compiled by Hraste. Ivšić's article on accentuation and dialectological problems, which appeared in 1951, is notable mainly for the reply it drew from Belić. Writing in the nineteenth volume of Južnoslovenski filolog, Belić accused Ivšić of falsifying facts in claiming priority on views expressed before him by Belić and Šaxmatov. The dialects of Vojvodina, aside from Ivić's studies were also analyzed by another pupil of Belić—Ivan Popović.

There is little dialect study in Slovenia. The only investigator to be mentioned there is Tine Logar, who published his "Dialektološke študije" in the last issue of Slavistična revija (1954). In Macedonia, on the other hand, several good monographs have appeared. Božo Vidoeski writes about northern Macedonian; Blaže Koneski and Milica Koneska have written about the western dialects; and the Chair of South Slavic Languages at the University of Skopje issues a series of students' graduation theses on various dialects.

The historical studies are strongest in Ljubljana, undoubtedly because of the influence of Nahtigal and Fran Ramovš. Nahtigal's book Slovanski jeziki is the best introduction to the history of Slavic languages available today. The second revised edition of this basic work came out in 1952. Ramovš was mainly interested in the development of Slovenian, as is testified by his grandiose project of a Slovenian historical grammar. That work, planned by him to consist of seven volumes, was unfortunately never finished. Two volumes dealing with the consonantism and dialects came out before the war. The preparation of the remaining volumes was cut short by his untimely death in 1952. We do have, however, his historical Morfologija slovenskega jezika, published shortly before his death by his students and based on his university lectures. Besides his work in Slovenian, Ramovš was also engaged in work on general Slavic historical topics. Of those, his work on Proto-Slavic intonations is most significant. A major contribution to Slovenian historical morphology is the study on word formation Besedotvorje slovenskega jezika by Anton Bajec. Its first part, dealing with the substantives, came out in 1950; the second, discussing the adjectives and compounds, in 1952. In Ljubljana there is also a considerable amount of interest in toponymics. The foremost among the investigators in that field is France Bezlaj, whose monograph on Slovenian river names was recently published by the Academy. Under his direction a meeting was called in the fall of 1956 in Ljubljana to co-ordinate the efforts of all Yugoslav scholars interested in onomastic studies.

The interest in historical work in Belgrade has manifested itself in the appearance of three texts on the history of Serbo-Croatian. To be mentioned first are the mimeographed university lectures of Belić on the history of

inflected forms published in two volumes in 1950 and 1951. Also in 1951 there appeared Pregled istorije srpskohrvatskog jezika by Branko Miletić, a sketchy exposition intended for use by college students. Finally, in 1955 Ivan Popović published his Istorija srpskohrvatskog jezika, a small and very unreliable book, severely criticized by the reviewers.[2] Under the guidance of Belić excellent work is being done on historical syntax. Two books in particular deserve to be singled out, both of them doctoral dissertations published in 1954: O perfektu bez pomoćnog glagola u srpskohrvatskom jeziku i srodnim sintaksičkim pojavama, by Irena Grickat, and Značenja srpskohrvatskog instrumentala i njihov razvoj, by Milka Ivić.

In Zagreb there is a lesser activity in historical studies. Stjepan Ivšić, the most eminent Slavist there, has not been very productive in recent years. Petar Skok, who died at the beginning of 1956 and who was primarily a Romance scholar, investigated the history of place names in Croatia. His major post-war contribution to that problem is a book Slavenstvo i romanstvo na Jadranskim otocima (1950). Of far greater importance is the fact that just before his death Skok completed his Etimološki rječnik hrvatskoga ili srpskoga jezika which is now being prepared for publication. It is the first Yugoslav etymological dictionary.

Henrik Barić of Sarajevo, the most eminent Yugoslav Indo-Europeanist, is interested primarily in Illyrian and the questions of linguistic substratum, but he writes occasionally on Slavic problems, especially in toponymics.

As far as descriptive studies go, we find several interesting investigations in phonetics. In Belgrade Branko Miletić published his Osnovi fonetike srpskog jezika (1952) and Djordje Kostić contributed numerous valuable articles on the nature of Serbo-Croatian intonations. In Zagreb the Institute of Phonetics put out a very useful work Srpskohrvatski jezik na pločama (1955). The records of texts of Serbian and Croatian origin, both ekavian and jekavian, are accompanied by a phonetic commentary by Ivšić and Kravar. In Ljubljana there appeared a number of articles on Slovenian phonetics by Mirko Rupel. His book Slovensko pravorečje came out in 1946.

In descriptive morphology and syntax the largest contributions are the following books: Sintaksa srpskog jezika,

by Lalević (Belgrade, 1951), Aspektna značenja, by Djuro Grubor (Zagreb, 1953), and Značenje aorista i imperfekta u srpskohrvatskom jeziku, by the late Aleksandar Stojićević (Ljubljana, 1951). Two descriptive grammars of Serbo-Croatian came out recently: Savremeni srpskohrvatski književni jezik, by Belić, in two volumes, the first dealing with phonetics (1951), the second with word formation 1949), and Gramatika hrvatskoga ili srpskog jezika, by Brabec, Hraste, and Živkovič (Zagreb, 1954). Of the two descriptive grammars of Macedonian, one by Horace G. Lunt was already mentioned above, the other is Gramatika na makedonskiot literaturen jazik, by Blaže Koneski of the University of Skopje (1952-54).

Old Church Slavic studies were greatly stimulated by the establishment of the Old Slavonic Academy in Zagreb in 1948. Renamed later as Old Slavonic Institute, it began publishing in 1952 the journal Slovo and a series of monographs collected in the Radovi Staroslavenskog Instituta. The Institute is mainly interested in Glagolitic texts of Croatian and Serbian recensions, and has begun collecting them in microfilm. The small staff of the Institute is also preparing material for a dictionary of Old Church Slavic. Among the contributors to the above-mentioned publications one should name the editor of Slovo, Josip Hamm, whose monograph on the dating of Glagolitic texts opens the series of Radovi, and who has written a textbook of Old Church Slavic, published in 1947. The most important works in Old Church Slavic and Church Slavonic published outside of the Institute are Žitja Konstantina in Metodija, by France Grivec (Ljubljana, 1951), Hrvatskoglagoljski blagdanar, a study of a Glagolitic manuscript of the beginning of the sixteenth century, by Josip Vrana (Rad, 285), and two works by Vladimir Mošin—Ćirilski rukopisi Jugoslavenske akademije (Zagreb, 1952-55), making available for the first time a description of all Cyrillic manuscripts kept in the archives of the Yugoslav Academy, and Makedonskoto evangelie na pop Jovana (Skopje, 1954), a Macedonian Church Slavonic monument from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century.

An edition of all Serbian medieval manuscripts is planned by the Institute of History of the Serbian Academy. Those manuscripts, scattered all over the country, are to be collected and photographed. A committee of three

historians and one linguist—Pavle Ivić—will prepare the edition.

As I mentioned above, very little work is being done on non-Yugoslav Slavic languages. A notable exception is the activity of Kiril Taranovski of Belgrade University who specializes in East Slavic versification. His doctoral dissertation, Ruski dvodelni ritmovi, appeared in 1953.[3]

As for linguistic periodicals, the most important is Južnoslovenski filolog, published by the Serbian Academy and edited by Belić. An extremely useful feature of this journal is an annual bibliography of all linguistic material published in Yugoslavia. Another excellent periodical is Slavistična revija, coming out in Ljubljana. Its linguistic section was run by Ramovš and, after his death, was taken over by Nahtigal. In 1954 the University of Sarajevo started a yearly publication called Pitanja književnosti i jezika, with Vuković heading its linguistic department. In Zagreb the only scholarly serial publication is Rad, of the Yugoslav Academy. The philological issues of Rad appear once or twice a year. The Academy, however, is planning to come out soon with a regular journal to be called Filologija and to have the same scope as Južnoslovenski filolog. Another new journal of the same type will soon make its appearance in Novi Sad. It is to be called Zbornik za lingvistiku i filologiju and will be published by the University in collaboration with Matica Srpska. The University of Skopje publishes Makedonski jazik. Other linguistic journals are concerned primarily with problems of good usage.

The hotly discussed Serbo-Croatian spelling reform is concerned mainly with working out a compromise between the phonetic principle used by the Serbs (pisaću, istoriski, pretstava) and the partly etymological principle supported by the Croats (pisat ću, historijski, predstava).

In concluding this brief sketch, I would like to mention the Third International Congress of Slavists held in Belgrade in September 1955. At the Congress American Slavists were represented by Professors Roman Jakobson, Wacław Lednicki, Horace G. Lunt, and Svatava Pirkova-Jakobson. The twenty-first volume of Južnoslovenski filolog carries a good summary of the proceedings.

Notes

1. This is a somewhat modified version of a paper read at the meeting of the Modern Language Association of America, in Washington, D.C., on December 28, 1956. Grateful acknowledgment is made to Yale University for the Blanche Elizabeth MacLeish Billings Memorial Award which enabled me to spend the summer of 1956 in Yugoslavia.

2. See Horace G. Lunt, Slavic Word, IV, 621-626, and Pavle Ivić, Južnoslovenski filolog, XXI, 310-335.

3. See the review by Roman Jakobson (Slavic Word, IV, 644-647).

ON THE USE OF ABLAUT AS A CRITERION IN DETERMINING LOAN-WORDS IN BALTIC AND SLAVIC

By William R. Schmalstieg

University of Kentucky

In the past it has been customary for scholars in the Baltic and Slavic fields to deny that any word in these languages could be borrowed if it stood in some recognized ablaut relationship to another word in the same language. Thus, for example, according to Ernst Fraenkel, Lith. slābnas 'weak' could not have been borrowed from R. slabyj or Pol. słaby 'weak' because in Lithuanian we also find the words slàbti/slambù 'to become weak' and slabnėti 'to become weak.'[1] Likewise in his discussion of Slavic loanwords in Germanic, V. Kiparsky says that the Ablaut in Balt.-Slav. is "possible only in indigenous words."[2]

Neither Fraenkel nor Kiparsky explains why he holds this position. There seems to be no theoretical reason why ablaut as a morphological procedure cannot be applied to borrowed as well as native words.

Examples of the application of ablaut to borrowed words can be found in any number of languages. In Pennsylvania German we find the plural /di: búdʃer-ʃèb/ from /der búdʃer-ʃàb/ 'butchershop' and /di: gaind/ as a plural of /di: gaund/ 'gown, dress.'[3] In the Germanic languages this particular alternation is generally called umlaut because of its origin. But the name is unimportant, and we really have to do with vowel alternation with morphemic significance.

The German verb schreiben 'to write' is conjugated as a strong verb. However it was originally borrowed from Lat. scrībo (cf. M.H.G. schriben and O.H.G. scriban). A colloquial noun der Schrieb 'the letter' appears to stand in ablaut relationship to schreiben just as der Trieb 'moving force' stands in ablaut relationship to treiben 'to drive.'

In Arabic the word jund(un) is a borrowing from

Iranian through Aramaic and eventually goes back to Pehlevi gund 'army, troop.' However we find derived verbs such as as jannada 'to levy troops' and tajannada 'to be enlisted.'[4]

The examples show that ablaut is merely another morphological procedure, and wherever ablaut is a live morphological procedure it can be used on borrowed as well as native words.

In regard to Lithuanian, A. Senn says, "Vowel gradation [ablaut] is a productive feature in the formation of words ... When neologisms are formed, the ablaut system is always carefully taken into consideration, and thus numerous lexical innovations of Primitive Indo-European appearance have been produced in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries."[5]

Examples of recently created words include: (1) įstaiga 'office' built on the verb steĩgti 'to found, to establish'; (2) išvada 'conclusion' from iš- 'out of' and vèsti 'to lead' (cf. R. vyvod 'conclusion'); (3) įtaiga 'suggestion' from į- 'in' and teĩgti 'to affirm'; (4) įtaka 'influence' from į- 'in' and tekéti 'to flow'; (5) įspūdis 'impression' from į- 'in' and spáusti 'to press' (cf. Ger. Eindruck, R. vpečatlenije, etc.).

In American Lithuanian we even find a word vãjus 'drive (in the sense of solicitation for a cause)' a completely new creation based on the verb výti 'to drive, to chase.'[6] In view, then, of the fact that ablaut is a live morphological procedure, there is no reason why new Lithuanian words cannot be created on old borrowings by ablaut derivation.

To return then to the problem of Lith. slābnas 'weak,' we find that it is certainly a borrowing from R. slabyj or Pol. słaby. The /n/ suffix is from contamination with the native Lith. silpnas 'weak.' The verbal suffix -nėti in slabnėti 'to become weak' is again a contamination with the native word silpnėti 'to become weak.' The root slab was used to form a verb of the nasal infix class, a common type in Lithuanian which has become very productive in the modern language. We can compare the adjective šlãpias 'wet, humid' and the nasal-infix verb šlàpti/šlampa 'to get wet.'

But even supposing that new ablaut formations were impossible in a given language, such as Lithuanian, it would still be possible for words borrowed from a closely related language such as Russian to appear to stand in ablaut relationship to native words.

In Lithuanian we find an ablaut relationship which shows the lengthened zero grade (i.e., /i:/ or /u:/) in the noun as opposed to the /a/ (from */o/) grade in the iterative verb. Some examples are skrỹdis 'flight' as opposed to skraidýti 'to fly to and fro' and spūdà, spū̃dis 'pressure, pressing' as opposed to spáudyti 'to press frequently.' Now it appears that paslūga 'service,' which appears in Pietkiewicz's Polish and Lithuanian Catechism of 1598 is certainly a Slavic borrowing.[7] But on the pattern established above paslūga 'service' is in apparent ablaut relationship with slaugýti 'to nurse, to take care of' and native Lithuanian paslaugà 'service.'

Another ablaut series is established by such native Lithuanian words as nykùs 'dismal; perishable' (lengthened zero grade of the root), naikùs 'perishable' (/a/ grade of the root) and naikìnti 'to destroy' (causative verb with /a/ grade of the root). Native Lithuanian words such as gývas 'alive,' gaivùs 'refreshing, comforting' gaivìnti 'to refresh' fall into the same pattern. Yet the Slavic borrowings tykùs, tỹkas 'calm, peaceful' (from W. R. ćixij)[8] appear to stand in ablaut relationship with the native roots taikà 'peace,' taikùs 'peaceful' and táikinti in the meaning 'to reconcile, to conciliate.'

To sum up, then, it is an error in methodology to assume that words which stand in ablaut chains in Baltic or Slavic cannot be borrowings.

Notes

1. "Zur Behandlung der slavischen Lehnwörter im ostlitauischen Dialekte von Twerecz (Tverečius)," Indogermanische Forschungen, LIII (1935), 131.

2. "Die gemeinslavischen Lehnwörter aus dem Germanischen," Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae (Helsinki, 1934), Ser. B, XXXII, No. 2, p. 9.

3. Carroll E. Reed, "The Adaptation of English to Pennsylvania German," American Speech, XXIII (1948), 241.

4. Arthur Jeffery, "The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an," Gaekwad's Oriental Series, LXXIX (1938), 104-105.

5. "Standard Lithuanian in the Making," The Slavonic and East European Review, XXII (1944), 59, 116.

6. Alfred Senn, "Einiges aus der Sprache der Amerika-Litauer," Studi Baltici, II (1932), 42.

7. Pr. Skardžius, Die slavischen Lehnwörter im Altlitauischen (Kaunas, 1931), 159.

8. Ibid., p. 222.

THE PROBLEM OF PREDICATIVES IN RUSSIAN

By Morton Benson

Ohio University

In Soviet linguistic circles there has been in recent years much bitter controversy about the establishment of a special form-class for so-called predicatives.[1] The history of this dispute goes back to 1928, when the linguist L. V. Ščerba cautiously suggested that uninflected words appearing only in the predicate be assigned to a special word-class, to be called in Russian kategorija sostojanija, literally the "category of state."[2] This term was selected since many of the words under discussion denoted a so-called state-of-being. Recently the term predicatives has come into use to represent words of this class, and for the sake of simplicity this term will be used here. Ščerba included not only impersonal predicate adverbs of the type Pozdno 'It is late,' but also short predicate adjectives, as in Ja gotov 'I am ready.'

Ščerba's suggestion was firmly supported by the Marrist school of linguistics, which always took syntax and not morphology as the proper basis of grammatical analysis. Such was, for example, the viewpoint of the leading spokesman of the Marrist camp, I. I. Meščaninov, in his book on the parts of speech.[3]

The leading non-Marrist grammarian of Russian, V. V. Vinogradov, seemed also to be in favor of a category of predicatives and considered it to be a full part of speech, in his Russkij jazyk.[4] However, in the new Academy Grammatika, edited by Vinogradov, he reversed his position and set up no separate category.[5] In Volume I (on Phonetics and Morphology) it is briefly mentioned twice, in the discussion of adverbs. In Volume II (on Syntax) no mention at all is made of the category. Words of the type pozdno are considered adverbs.

At present, two opposing views exist regarding this question. One group is for the setting up of a class of

predicatives in line with the Ščerba tradition. The opponents of this have two main arguments: (1) no historical study has been made which would justify the recognition of a new word-class; and (2) predicatives have no special morphological features.

The divergent viewpoints were presented at a discussion on the parts of speech held at the Soviet Academy of Sciences in 1954.[6] In addition, three articles were published on this subject in the periodical Voprosy jazykoznanija in 1955. The linguists N. S. Pospelov and A. V. Isačenko declared themselves in favor of predicatives.[7] A. B. Šapiro defended the opposing viewpoint, basing his arguments mainly on the Formalist position of the Fortunatov school.[8]

After this brief review of the controversy, the following approach might be suggested. In modern grammatical analysis word-classes are set up, whenever possible, on the basis of inflection. With uninflected words, however, syntactic criteria must be used.[9] Since the words under discussion here are uninflected, we might define them as follows: A predicative in Russian is an uninflected word that regularly constitutes a complete utterance when standing alone, i.e., when preceded and followed by silence. Its intonational patterns are similar to those of longer sentence types. For example: Žarko 'It is hot'; Žarko? 'Is it hot?'; Žal' 'It is a shame'; Prijatno 'It is pleasant'; etc.

Such utterances have present-tense meaning. The very absence of the copula indicates the present.[10] The auxiliary verb bylo 'was' (always with neuter agreement) and budet 'will be' are used to form the past and future tenses: Žarko bylo 'It was hot'; Žarko budet 'It will be hot.' The particle by marks the conditional: Bylo by žarko 'It would be hot.' Occasionally, a verb of the type stanovit'sja 'to become' is used as the auxiliary in any of the three tenses: Stanovitsja žarko 'It is becoming hot'; Stalo žarko 'It became hot.' These last two sentences illustrate clearly the uninflected character of predicatives.[11] Compare the following sentence with a predicate adjective in the instrumental after stanovit'sja: Pogoda stanovitsja žarkoj 'The weather is becoming hot.'

Predicative sentences are impersonal: they have no subject. Compare: Èto ploxo 'This [i.e., something definite] is bad,' and Ploxo 'Things (in general) are bad.'

Predicative utterances should be considered a

full-sentence type in Russian.[12] They stand apart from minor sentence types such as answers, exclamations, and namings. In certain respects they are similar in structure to one-word nominal sentences. Compare Šumno 'It is noisy,' and Šum 'There is noise.'

On the basis of our definition we do not include short predicate adjectives in our word-class, as practically all Soviet linguists do.[13] Short predicate adjectives occur in an entirely different set of environments. They do not stand alone, i.e., they are used with a subject. Furthermore, short predicate adjectives are inflected for gender and number, and therefore should not be included in any class of uninflected words. To be sure, the homophony of many short neuter predicative adjectives and predicatives has led certain grammarians to look on both as identical.[14] A. M. Peškovskij struggled hard to differentiate between the two in infinitive-predicative constructions but did not come to clear-cut results.[15] Vinogradov points out that certain predicatives are morphologically different from short neuter predicate adjective forms in having a distinctive stress: ból'no and bol'nó, vol'nó and vól'no, pólno and polnó, etc.[16]

It is obvious that adverbs have entirely different environments than predicatives and make up a separate part of speech. Compare the following two sentences: On žarko sporil "He was arguing heatedly,' containing the adverb žarko, and Žarko 'It is hot,' consisting of the predicative. To be sure, the morphological similarity between adverbs in -o and most predicatives is so consistent that the recognition of the latter as a subclass of the former would undoubtedly appear more acceptable to many who read this paper. Whether an independent word-class (part of speech) or a subclass is recognized, is not the essential question here. What should be established is the special syntactic role of predicatives.

Predicative utterances, like most other major sentence types, can be expanded by dative or accusative objects, adverbial intensifiers, infinitives, negative and interrogative particles, and time and place modifiers. Numerous illustrations of these are provided in existing grammars of Russian, and, therefore, only two examples are given here: (1) Nam bylo očen' prijatno otdyxat' doma 'We found it very pleasant to rest at home'; (2) Ne bylo li žarko včera? 'Wasn't it hot yesterday?'

Morphologically, predicatives are of five main types.

(1) Those which are homophonous with adverbs derived from adjectives. The ending is usually spelt -o: Udobno 'It is comfortable.' The corresponding adjective is udobnyj 'comfortable.' Type 1 is the most numerous.

(2) Those which have the same ending as in (1), but which correspond to no adjective: Nado 'It is necessary'; Možno 'One may.'

(3) Comparative forms in -e: Udobnee 'It is more comfortable.'

(4) Past passive participles: Osveščeno 'It is lit up.'

(5) Those with noun endings: Žal' 'It is a shame'; Pora 'It is time.' As already mentioned, the neuter form bylo is used for the past tense of all predicatives. Thus, the normal agreement would be: Pora bylo spat' 'It was time to sleep'; Mne len' bylo zanimat'sja 'I felt too lazy to study'; Emu oxota bylo guljat' 'He felt like walking.' Occasionally, words of this type may waver in usage between predicative and noun. Vinogradov gives several examples of such parallel forms: pora bylo and pora byla, len' bylo and len' byla, oxota bylo and oxota byla.[17]

The recognition of predicatives as a separate word-class or subclass is an necessary in lexicography as in the description of the syntax. In the 1940 Ušakov Slovar', which is the most complete dictionary of modern Russian available, the treatment of predicatives, especially of those ending in -o, is inconsistent and incomplete. Although numerous predicatives are indicated, usually by examples given under the definition of the corresponding adjective or adverb form, many other predicatives are not given at all. The following illustrations from Ušakov will demonstrate this inconsistent treatment: Rano 'It is early' is given but Pozdno 'It is late' is omitted; Udobno 'It is comfortable' is given, but Ujutno 'It is cozy' is omitted. Other typical omissions are: Čudno 'It is marvelous'; Sumračno 'It is overcast'; Radostno 'It is cheerful'; etc. The situation in the abridged Ožegov Slovar' of 1952 is worse. The very large Slovar' sovremennogo russkogo literaturnogo jazyka, now being compiled, may give a somewhat better treatment.

Such omissions as listed above are most misleading, since no morphological or semantic criteria for determining just which adjectives and adverbs do possess corresponding predicative forms have been worked out. A newcomer to

Russian consulting any presently available dictionary might react in two ways. Firstly, if a predicative is not indicated, he would perhaps assume that it does not exist. This assumption is incorrect, as the examples given above demonstrate. Secondly, if he were to become aware of any of the omissions already described, he might infer that all adjectives with an adverb in -o have a corresponding predicative. This is also untrue, since as Šapiro has pointed out, there do exist such adjectives which have no corresponding predicatives.[18] Examples would be: gordyj 'proud,' slučajnyj 'unexpected,' zlobnyj 'spiteful,' predikativnyj 'predicative,' etc.

We may conclude with the following. The establishment of a word-class or subclass (of adverbs) on a syntactic basis is suggested. Detailed investigations of this word-class in modern Russian are necessary. Such investigations might answer the following questions.

(1) Just which predicatives do exist in Russian?

(2) Can any valid semantic generalizations be made concerning predicatives?

(3) Which predicatives may or may not be used with infinitives and/or objects, and which usually are?

(4) Where do predicative utterances fit in an overall scheme of Russian sentence types?

The answers to these questions would be a significant contribution to any attempt at a full description of Russian syntax and lexicon.

Notes

1. A version of this paper was read at the 1956 summer meeting of the Linguistic Society of America in Ann Arbor.

2. "O častjax reči v russkom jazyke," Russkaja reč', II (1928), 17.

3. Členy predloženija i časti reči (Moskva-Len., 1945), p. 270. See also A. V. Isačenko, "Morphologie, syntaxe, et phraséologie," Cahiers Ferdinand de Saussure, VII (1948).

4. (Moskva-Leningrad, 1947), pp. 42-44, and 399-421.

5. Grammatika russkogo jazyka (Moskva, 1953), Vol. I; Vol. II was published in 1954 in two parts.

6. Voprosy jazykoznanija, 1955, No. 1, pp. 162-166.

7. N. S. Pospelov, "V zaščitu kategorii sostojanija," Vop. jaz., 1955, No. 2, pp. 55-65; A. V. Isačenko, "O kategorii sostojanija v slavjanskix jazykax," Vop. jaz., 1955, No. 6, pp. 48-65.

8. A. B. Šapiro, "Est' li v russkom jazyke kategorija sostojanija kak čast' reči?" Vop. jaz., 1955, No. 2, pp. 42-54. Šapiro's viewpoint was supported in an article received after this paper was written: F. Travniček, "Zametki o 'kategorii sostojanija,'" Vop. jaz., 1956, No. 3, pp. 46-53. Travniček concentrates his attack on the semantic classification of predicatives attempted by E. M. Galkina-Fedoruk in Sovremennyj russkij jazyk, ed. V. V. Vinogradov (Moskva, 1952), I, 394-404.

9. See L. Bloomfield, Language (New York, 1933), pp. 184-206; B. Bloch and G. L. Trager, Outline of Linguistic Analysis (Baltimore, 1942), pp. 60-61; C. C. Fries, The Structure of English (New York, 1952), pp. 65-141; O. Jesperson, The Philosophy of Grammar (London-New York, 1924), pp. 60-61.

10. We can speak here of a zero morpheme of tense. Pospelov (p. 56) considers the tense and mood markers (zero, bylo, budet, by) to be the morphological features of predicatives.

11. Occasionally, where an infinitive is apparently felt to function as the subject, the instrumental neuter adjective is used instead of a predicative: Dolgo dumat' kazalos' Bel'tovu smešnym "Bel'tov thought it ridiculous to reflect for a long time" (Gercen).

12. Bloomfield indicates this in his Language, p. 174.

13. See, for example, Vinogradov, Rus. jaz., pp. 402-403; Isačenko, "O kat.," p. 63.

14. For example, G. Gunnarsson, La Décadence de l'adjectif nominal dans les langues slaves (Paris-Stockholm, 1931), p. 87.

15. A. M. Peškovskij, Russkij sintaksis v naučnom osveščenii (Moskva, 1920), pp. 360-363.

16. Rus. jaz., p. 408.

17. Ibid., pp. 417-418. See also the Ušakov Slovar', entries oxota and neoxota.

18. Šapiro, p. 54.

PART TWO

THE TEACHING OF THE RUSSIAN LANGUAGE IN AMERICAN SECONDARY SCHOOLS—AUTUMN 1957

By H. Wilmarth Mott, III

Tenafly Junior High School
Tenafly, New Jersey

With the exception of rapid expansion in the public school system of Portland, Oregon, the teaching of the Russian language in American secondary schools continues to increase at a slow pace. The results of a survey completed on October 1, 1957, indicate that ten secondary schools in the United States are offering the Russian language in the 1957-58 academic year. None of these represents a Russian program inaugurated for the first time this year, although four of them were initiated within the past three years. Since 1940, seventeen American secondary schools have offered courses in the Russian language; seven of these have been discontinued.

Four of the schools now offering Russian are public high schools, three of them located in Portland, Oregon. The other six schools are private college-preparatory institutions. To my knowledge no public school in the eastern sector of the United States has ever offered the Russian language. And no school south of Chatham, Virginia, has taught Russian. Except for the University of Minnesota High School, no private school west of the Mississippi River has offered Russian. Generally, the pattern has been western public schools and eastern private schools as those which have attempted to establish Russian-language programs.

Portland, Oregon

Under Mrs. Marjorie McDonald study of the Russian language was begun in Washington High School in 1944. The program, which has become a permanent integral part of

the curriculum at Washington High School, has expanded to include two levels of Russian. This year Mrs. McDonald is teaching a second-year Russian language class of fourteen.

Mrs. McDonald's success with Russian led to the establishment of two other Russian language programs in the Portland school system. At Cleveland High School, three Russian-language classes, two first-year and one advanced, are under way this year. The anticipated enrollment was from twenty to twenty-five students in each class. A third secondary school in Portland, Franklin High School, has a beginning class in Russian of about sixteen students.

Mrs. McDonald writes that this fall she has been transferred to Madison High School, where she plans to inaugurate two more first-year Russian language classes in the fall of 1958. She adds that the Portland school system has engaged a new teacher who is trained in the Russian language, which presents the possibility that by the 1958-59. school year Portland, Oregon, may have five separate secondary-school Russian language programs.

New York, New York

New York City contains two private boys' schools whose Russian language programs continue to flourish. Mr. Thomas Reilly, of the Horace Mann School, reports that he is teaching two Russian language classes this fall. Horace Mann School, which began offering Russian in 1951, has offered up to four levels of the language. This year Mr. Reilly has nine pupils in his beginning class and seven students in a second class which combines second- and third-year Russian.

At the Riverdale Country School, which is only one-half mile from the Horace Mann School, a Russian language program was initiated under Mr. J. Donald Neitz in February 1954. The policy at Riverdale has been to begin a first-year class in Russian every other year and offer a second-year course to the Russian-language students the following year. This fall Mr. Neitz anticipates a first-year class of from seven to nine students. Although the Russian programs at the Horace Mann School and at the Riverdale School began completely independently of each other, the classes have since enjoyed field trips together, and Messrs. Reilly and Neitz have been able to consult together frequently.

Other Secondary School Russian Language Programs

The remaining five Russian language programs are spread about the country. The only public high school outside of Portland, Oregon, to offer Russian is the Maine Township High School, located in Des Plaines, Illinois. Here there is one class of beginning Russian, which has an enrollment of sixteen students.

At the St. Albans School for Boys in Washington, D.C., Mr. George Gabritchevsky is teaching a first-year Russian language course. Five pupils, three tenth-graders and two eleventh-graders, have enrolled in this course for the 1957-58 school year.

Mr. Gerharde Schade writes from the St. Pauls School for Boys, in Concord, New Hampshire, that he will resume his teaching of the Russian language after two years in which no Russian was given at St. Pauls. This is a voluntary group of five pupils, all proven language students, two of whom are of Russian heritage. The tentative plan is to extend the program for two years and start another beginning group in the 1959-60 school year. Mr. Schade comments that it is very likely that one or two of his fellow masters at the school will audit his class in Russian.

The University of Minnesota Demonstration High School in Minneapolis, Minnesota, one of the first American secondary schools to introduce the Russian language, continues its Russian program under Dr. Emma Marie Birkmaier, who is a Professor of Education at the University. Dr. Birkmaier's classes are the only ones to be taught by the direct, or conversational, method of instruction. The Russian classes at the University of Minnesota High School have included as many as twenty-five students in addition to a like number of children enrolled in elementary-school Russian-language courses.

At the Chatham Hall School for Girls in Chatham, Virginia, Mrs. Marie Gagarine has for several years taught a three-semester course in Russian area studies. A portion of her curriculum has been devoted to the fundamentals of the Russian language. Although Mrs. Gagarine was on leave in the 1956-57 academic year, plans were made for the resumption of her course in 1957-58.

Summary and Conclusion

The experience in these few schools proves that the

Russian language can play a beneficial role in the curriculum of an American secondary school. The fact that many men and women who were introduced to Russian in secondary school have continued to study Russian in college and in the armed forces and later entered the Russian area field professionally demonstrates that the Russian language is a course worthy of inclusion in any secondary school program. Unfortunately, most American-born Russian language experts of today had to wait until they reached college before they began to study Russian. Most of them did not master the language until they reached the graduate school level.

Who are the people best equipped to remedy this situation? It appears that the burden falls upon those teachers and scholars who now comprise the personnel of the Russian language field. They best realize the value of the Russian language. The job is to convince secondary school administrators that Russian, in view of the present international situation, at least deserves a position equal to that of French, Spanish, German, or Latin in secondary school curricula. In ten schools this task has been accomplished successfully.

NEWS AND NOTES

AATSEEL Convention and MLA Slavic Sections at Madison

The Fourteenth Annual Meeting of the AATSEEL was held at Madison, Wisconsin, from September 9-11, concurrently with the MLA annual meeting.

AATSEEL Program. In the first AATSEEL session, on Monday, September 9, from 9:00 to 10:30 a.m., with Arthur P. Coleman, Alliance College, as chairman, the following papers were read: "The Personal Relations of Tolstoj and Turgenev," Edward Miček, University of Texas; "The Contemporary Serbian Novel," Vasa Mihailovich, Wayne State University; report on the Seventh Congress of the International Association of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Heidelberg, West Germany, by J. B. Rudnyćkyj, University of Manitoba. Papers in the session from 10:45-12:45, under the chairmanship of Professor Claude P. Lemieux, U. S. Naval Academy, included "Reflections on the Polish Drama," Marion Moore Coleman, Alliance College; and "Russian and Polish Themes in Early American Opera," Lubov B. Keefer, Johns Hopkins University. At the meeting from 2:00-3:15 p.m., under the chairmanship of the Rev. W. U. McBrearty, S. J., Fordham University, there was a discussion of recent impressions from behind the Iron Curtain by a panel composed of Edmund Ordon, Wayne State University; Professor Lemieux; Harold Klagstad, Indiana University; and T. F. Domaradzki, University of Montreal. Members of the panel had traveled to the Soviet Union, Poland, and Yugoslavia during summer 1957.

On Tuesday, Sept. 10, 10:45-12:15, under the chairmanship of Professor Zbigniew Folejewski, University of Wisconsin, the papers included "Reflections on a Comparative Study of Slavic Numerals," Edmund S. Przybylski, University of Wisconsin; "Reported Forms in Standard Bulgarian," Harold L. Klagstad, Indiana University; and "Loan Words in Russian," Felix Oinas, Indiana University.

On Wednesday, Sept. 11, the final meeting, 9:00-10:30 a.m., was a Joint Session with the Eastern Canadian Association of Slavists and East European Specialists, under the chairmanship of Professor Lemieux. The papers included "The Catholicism of Norwid," Professor Domaradzki; "Problems in Slavistic Field Work in Canada and the U.S.A.," Professor Rudnyćkyj; and "Catherine II's Reaction to Radiščev," Roderick P. Thaler, Bishop's University.

MLA Slavic Sections Programs. In the MLA 1 Section, with Oleg Maslenikov, University of California, and Edmund Zawacki, University of Wisconsin, as joint acting chairmen,

from 3:45 to 5:15 on Monday, September 9, the program included "L. Tolstoj's Power of Darkness and Andreev's Anathema," Jack A. Posin, Stanford University; "On the Tension Between Material and Structure in War and Peace," Kathryn Feuer, University of Vermont; and "Scientific Research, Love, and the Villain in Recent Soviet Fiction," George Gibian, Smith College. The 1958 officers elected for MLA Slavic 1 were Edward J. Brown, Brown University, chairman; and Leon I. Twarog, Boston University, secretary. MLA Section 2, Slavic and East European Linguistics, was held on Tuesday, September 10, with Joseph T. Shaw of Indiana University as chairman. The papers included "A Re-examination of the Lithuanian -s- Future," William R. Schmalstieg, University of Kentucky; "Slavic Kinship Terms and Taboo," Edward Stankiewicz, Indiana University; "The Stress Patterns of Russian Nouns," Professor Maslenikov; and "The Role of Dialectisms in the Russian Literary Language After the Revolution," Professor Folejewski. MLA Slavic 2 officers elected for 1958 were Professor Folejewski, chairman, and Dean S. Worth, University of California (Los Angeles), secretary.

Business Meeting of AATSEEL. At the business meeting of the AATSEEL, 2:00-3:00 p.m. on September 10, the following AATSEEL officers were elected for calendar 1958: President: Professor Folejewski; Vice Presidents: Professor Twarog, Professor Maslenikov, and Thomas F. Magner, University of Minnesota. Professor Ordon was re-elected Executive Secretary and Treasurer, and Professor Shaw will continue as Editor of The Slavic and East European Journal. In his President's report, Professor Lemieux stressed the importance of further development of the Journal and of the teaching of Russian in American high schools. An AATSEEL Committee for Promoting the Study of Russian in High Schools was appointed (its report is printed separately below). Professor Ordon, in his preliminary Treasurer's report, announced that there has been a good response to the reorganized and expanded Journal, as reflected in a gratifying increase in the number of member-subscribers. He stressed the necessity, if the AATSEEL and its Journal are to develop properly, that all members of the profession join-subscribe. He stated that the Treasurer's report for the calendar year 1957 will be published in the March 1958 issue of the Journal. Professor Ordon also pointed out that individuals and institutions should avail themselves of the service which the AATSEEL provides through his office, as a clearing house for those seeking positions in the profession and for institutions seeking teachers specializing in the field. This service is available to members-subscribers and to institutions without cost. After the report of the Editor of the Journal, the business session went on record as strongly commending the reorganization and expansion of the Journal that has taken place during the past year, so that it has become the only professional journal in this hemisphere concentrating in research in the humanities and in pedagogy in the Slavic and East European field. The Editor was also asked to convey to Indiana University officials the appreciation of the AATSEEL for its support with regard to the Journal and the bonus volumes made available to members through an

arrangement with the Slavic and East European Series of Indiana University.

During the Joint Session with the Eastern Canadian Association of Slavists and East European Specialists, the following motion, made by Professor Lemieux, was unanimously carried:

> Be it resolved, That, on the occasion of the fourteenth annual meeting of the American Association of Teachers of Slavic and East European Languages and the third joint meeting of American and Canadian Slavists, the convention express its pleasure in the joint meeting and congratulate the University of Montreal on its success in publishing Études slaves et est-européenes —Slavic and East European Studies, thus greatly promoting Slavic Studies in Canada.

It was announced that the next annual meeting of the AATSEEL will be New York City after Christmas in 1958.

AATSEEL Russian FL Project

The AATSEEL's Committee on Promoting the Study of Russian in High Schools was selected on a regional basis and includes: Professor Serge A. Zenkovsky, Harvard University; Professor Oleg A. Maslenikov, University of California (Berkeley); Professor Francis Sobotka, University of Illinois; Professor Justina D. Epp, Ohio State University; Mrs. Kyra T. Bostroem, University of Connecticut, Waterbury, Connecticut; Professor Claude P. Lemieux, U. S. Naval Academy; Professor Catherine Wolkonsky, Vassar College; and Professor Helen B. Yakobson, George Washington University, Chairman.

At the present time members of the Committee are trying to acquaint themselves with local conditions and to find possible ways and means of financing the proposed pilot programs.

The pilot programs are to be established on an experimental basis. They are to serve as workshops for determining the best approach, the best methods, and the most suitable teaching aids (such as films, slides, tapes).

The Committee will try to introduce such programs whenever and wherever local conditions are favorable (sympathetic high school principal, alert and active PTA, or a community willing to support such a program). It has been decided to develop these pilot programs in co-operation with the Russian or Slavic departments of a local college or university.

The Committee will work in close contact with the MLA FLES program and with the U.S. Office of Education. Dr. Marjorie Johnston of the U.S. Office of Education has assured me that the work of the Committee will be given the greatest possible publicity (circulars to the high school principles, notices in school bulletins, etc.).

The growing awareness of teachers and educators that it is unrealistic to limit the language offerings in high schools to French, German, and Spanish; the growing awareness of students and their parents of the real need for knowledge of Russian (especially in fields of science); the increasing number of

inquiries received by the Office of Education from school officials, parents, and PTA members concerning the availability of Russian in high schools; and the growing number of references in the press in regard to the lack of U. S. Russian Language Specialists—all these factors make the members of the Committee confident that it will be successful in launching such pilot programs of Russian studies in high schools.

Helen B. Yakobson, Chairman

Further Expansion of the Journal

The Executive Secretary and Treasurer of the AATSEEL and the Editor of The Slavic and East European Journal are happy to announce that negotiations have been completed which make it possible to expand the Journal further during 1958, from the present eighty pages to ninety-six pages per issue. The additional pages will make it possible to expand further the space available for articles, and, especially, for reviews. Beginning with the Spring 1958 issue, each number will include a list of books received.

The arrangement with the Indiana University Slavic and East European Series, whereby AATSEEL members receive bonus volumes in addition to the four issues of the Journal, is being continued. Members will receive, during 1958, the following bonus publications:

Mark V. Vishniak, "Sovremennye zapiski"—Vospominanija redaktora (available now)

Joseph T. Shaw, ed., with others, The 1957 American Bibliography of Slavic and East European Studies ... (to appear in the summer)

The feasibility is now being explored, by the editor of the annual Bibliography and by the Editorial Committee of the Indiana Slavic and East European Series, of expanding the bibliography for 1957 and later years, to cover the social sciences as well as the humanities.

AATSEEL Employment Service

The attention of AATSEEL members and institutions is again invited to the employment service which the Executive Secretary and Treasurer of the AATSEEL has operated without cost, as a convenience to the profession, for many years. Members seeking employment should send a curriculum vitae and information as to their qualifications and the kind of position sought. This information will be made available as appropriate to institutions seeking new staff members. All communications are kept confidential. Address: Professor Edmund Ordon, AATSEEL Executive Secretary and Treasurer, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan.

Language Laboratory Survey

The MLA FL Program is preparing to make a national survey of language laboratories. The U. S. Office of Education

will publish the results in a special bulletin. If there is a language lab at your institution (college, university, or high school), please send a postal card with the name and address of the person to receive the FL Program questionnaire to Dr. Kenneth Mildenberger, MLA, 6 Washington Square North, New York 3, N.Y.

Review of Russian Studies

During 1957-58 the Social Science Research Council is sponsoring a general survey and review of the field of Russian studies in the United States. Since the inception of integrated Russian area studies in American universities approximately ten years ago, the field has grown in size and scope. Academic and world conditions have changed considerably, and the requirements facing the field have altered to some degree. The present review is designed to assess past performance in the field and to make recommendations for the development and strengthening of Russian studies during the coming decade.

A committee consisting of Professors Black (Princeton), chairman, Byrnes (Indiana), Jelavich (California), Roberts (Columbia), Shulman (Harvard), Treadgold (Washington), and Mr. Ruggles (Council on Library Resources) is directing the review in consultation with scholars in the field. The review is under the general supervision of the Joint Committee on Slavic Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council.

One of the main tasks of the review is to re-examine the fundamental objectives of this field. What is the purpose of Russian area studies? What national need is the field attempting to meet? What justification is there for seeking to expand and improve Russian area studies?

In assessing Russian area studies, the review will concentrate on four major issues: research, organization and development, area training, and the impact of the field on general education. Concurrently, a separate but complementary study of library problems and needs in the Slavic and East European field is being undertaken by the Association of Research Libraries.

American research on the Russian area is being surveyed on a discipline-by-discipline basis with leading scholars reviewing research in each of the following nine disciplines: economics, fine arts, geography, history, linguistics, literature, philosophy and religion, political science, natural science, and social relations. This review of research will attempt not only to evaluate past achievements but also to point out major gaps and deficiencies, thereby indicating the direction in which future research efforts in each discipline might fruitfully be channelled.

Problems being reviewed in connection with the organization and development of Russian area studies include relations between the universities and the government, the role of a journal in the field, exchanges with the USSR, relations with foreign non-Communist scholars working in the field, and the type of organization and financing needed to ensure continuity

and central direction in the future development of Russian area studies.

Russian area training is being examined in some detail. The past experience and current status of distinct graduate Russian area training programs in American universities is being studied through questionnaires and visits to such programs. Former students in these programs are being polled. The training needs of the academic community and the government are being carefully considered. In the light of these investigations, the review committee will make recommendations for future Russian area training. Particular attention will be paid to the goals of training. What kind of students are being trained for what purpose? Specific issues such as language training, the area and discipline components of training, the problem of "integration," the role of the area faculty, the administration and financing of training, placement, and scholarships and fellowships will also be considered.

The problems of research and of area training are being examined during the fall and winter of 1957-58. During the remainder of 1958 the organization and development of the field and the impact of Russian area studies on general education and on the informed public will be reviewed.

One of the main objectives of the review is to stimulate wide ranging discussion and imaginative thinking concerning the current problems and future prospects of Russian area studies. The success of the review will depend in large part on the participation in it of the widest possible body of opinion, both within and outside the field. Ideas, suggestions, and criticism on any aspect of the review or concerning the field of Russian area studies in any way should be sent to the chairman or staff assistant of the review committee at the address below.

Review of Slavic Studies: C. E. Black, Chairman
John M. Thompson, Staff Assistant
Room 44, 90 Nassau Street
Princeton, New Jersey

North American Committee for Co-operation with Polish Universities

Through the initiative of Professor T. F. Domaradzki, Director, Department of Slavic Studies, University of Montreal, the North American Committee for Co-operation with Polish Universities has been created, for the purpose of sponsoring exchange of cultural and learned publications, and also for the exchange of students, lecturers, and research workers between American and Polish universities. The plan of the committee includes giving special assistance to the Catholic University of Lublin, by associating it with the University of Montreal and/or Fordham University, and attempting to encourage the introduction of series of lectures or of summer courses on Western literature, arts, history, economic and political institutions, in Polish universities.

Officers of the Committee are as follows: Professor

Domaradzki, Chairman; Z. Folejewski, University of Wisconsin, and W. Wagner, University of Notre Dame, Vice Presidents; E. Ehrenkreutz, University of Michigan, Secretary General; W. Chrypinski, University of Detroit and University of Windsor, Assistant Secretary; and L. Kos-Rabcewicz-Zubkowski, University of Montreal, Financial Secretary. Advisors to the Committee include B. R. Bugelski, University of Buffalo; A. P. Coleman, Alliance College; E. Gilson, University of Toronto; W. C. Jaskievicz, S.J., Fordham University; Mgr. O. Maurault, University of Montreal; F. J. Oinas, Indiana University; P. Ostafin, University of Michigan; A. Paplauskas-Ramunas, University of Ottawa; J. B. Rudnyćkyj, University of Montreal; and also (subject to their acceptance) J. Sanchez Villa Senor, S.J., Universidad Ibero-Americana, Mexico City, and L. K. Shook, University of Toronto.

The Chairman of the Committee has contacted a number of professors, especially of Polish origin, on the staffs of different institutions of higher learning on the North American Continent. He particularly urges the immediate establishment of exchange of publications between American and Polish institutions and the contribution of books from library reserves of American university libraries to Polish institutions.

Ten Years of "Slavistica"

The end of 1957 will mark the completion of ten full years of the existence of the series "Slavistica," which will then have a total of thirty publications to its credit. The series is edited by Professor J. B. Rudnyćkyj, University of Manitoba, and it is published by the Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences, UVAN of Canada, In Winnipeg. The series relates to Slavic languages, literatures, cultures, ethnography, archeology, etc., with special attention to the problems of the Eastern Slavic world. In addition to the separate studies on subjects of Slavic interest, the series has included annual bibliographies of Slavistica Canadiana since 1950.

American Journals in the Humanities

All members of the profession will find useful the article, "American Journals in the Humanities: A Guide to Scope and Editorial Policy," in the September 1957 PMLA Supplement (pp. 52-64). This guide presents brief statements of the scope, editorial policies, and reviewing status of forty-eight publications in the humanities, including this Journal, most of which (like this Journal) use the MLA Style Sheet. Authors who wish to submit articles to learned publications, including this one, would do well to consult the general statement prefatory to the information on specific journals, and also the statements of policies and scope of the journal to which they plan to submit contributions. The concise statement on reviews is particularly commendable and is considered worthy of quotation here: "The general principles of reviewing are three: (1) succinct statement of the contents; (2) suggestions in brief of the flavor of the writing or the author's slant; (3) a critical evaluation of content and presentation."

REVIEWS

Hans Kohn. Basic History of Modern Russia. Princeton, N.J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1957. 191 pp., $1.25.

John Shelton Curtiss. The Russian Revolutions of 1917. Princeton, N. J.: D. Van Nostrand, 1957. 191 pp., $1.25.

David J. Dallin. The Changing World of Soviet Russia. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1956. 422 pp., $5.00.

The problems of interpreting Russia's revolution are clearly reflected in these three complementary studies, written by distinguished students of Russia and intended for a wide public. The first covers the story from 1801 to 1917, the second deals with the revolutionary year alone, while the third is a general interpretation of Communist rule since 1917. The first two, it should be added, are in the Anvil paperback series especially designed for college teaching. Each has about one hundred pages of text, followed by an almost equal amount of space devoted to selected documents, and a brief bibliography.

The critical problem faced by these authors is not one of ascertaining the facts but rather of explaining Russia to the American reader. It is true that in Dallin's case the facts still present a formidable problem, but even here the more difficult task is that of explanation and interpretation. What these authors must explain, in its simplest form, is why Russia's history has followed a different path from that of the Western democracies. This large issue inevitably centers around the revolutions of 1917, which all three volumes discuss, and leads to many specific questions. Why, for instance, was the liberal movement in Russia so weak? Could Russia have continued to develop into a modern state along liberal European lines? What is the relationship between Marxism and the Russian revolution? What is the nature of the new Russia that has emerged as a result of Stalin's policies?

Kohn describes the growth of Russian liberalism with eloquence and sympathy, distinguishing between the first liberal period, 1861-81, and the second, 1906-17. Indeed, the main theme of his little volume is the failure of Russian liberalism. Many historians regard the reforms of 1861 as the crucial turning point in Russian history, although Kohn does not rate them very highly. He recognizes their "fundamental importance" (p. 31), but he is even more impressed by the reluctance with which they were implemented. He refers to "the

feeble trends towards legality" (p. 50) in this period, and believes that these gains were "fatally weakened" (p. 50) during the reign of Alexander III. As a result, liberalism never became a powerful force. Three reasons in particular are stressed by Kohn to explain this failure: "the conceited stubbornness and the malevolent stupidity of the government, the lack of parliamentary experience in Russia, and the chaos which the First World War ... produced" (p. 61). Liberalism was thus not strong enough to take advantage of the opportunities offered in 1917, and the Bolsheviks won out. Kohn nevertheless feels that Russia's destiny was, and is, to become a part of Europe, i.e., democratic. The Bolshevik victory was in no sense inevitable, and Russia's natural development was interrupted because the crisis of 1917 was reached before Russia was sufficiently Europeanized. Even today, according to Kohn, there is still reason to believe that Russia will resume the course from which it was fortuitously derailed in 1917 (pp. 116-118). Kohn's is the traditional liberal interpretation of Russian history, and it is presented with great clarity and vigor. The issues of this period are set forth systematically, and ideology, economics, and literature are skillfully woven into the political narrative.

The interpretation of Curtiss is strictly limited to the revolutionary year. The underlying force which he sees as determining the outcome is the need for economic and political reform, and he believes that both the Tsarist and the Provisional governments had it within their power to solve these problems. The Stolypin reform might conceivably have been successful had it been properly implemented. Curtiss is much less optimistic than Kohn, however, as to the chances of the liberals. The Provisional Government failed, he maintains, because "the middle and upper classes ... consistently refused to permit land reform and to end the war on a compromise basis. An insincere and tricky foreign policy was aggravated by the unnecessary offensive of July, which resulted in disaster." (pp. 103-104.) The one liberal program which Curtiss believes might have succeeded was that of General Aleksandr Verxovskij, who was appointed Minister of War by Kerenskij in September. He advocated a compromise peace with the Germans in agreement with the Allies, or failing this a defensive military policy on Germany's part. At home, he favored the agrarian policy of the Socialist Revolutionaries. It is Curtiss's view that this program would have saved the day for the Provisional government, but Kerenskij refused to give Verxovskij the power to implement it (pp. 57-58, 104). Curtiss' particular concern is with the personalities, policies, and maneuvers of the revolutionary year, and it is in these terms that he explains the Bolshevik success. There is relatively little discussion of Leninist theory in the text, although there are numerous excerpts from his works in the section of readings, and Marx does not put in an appearance.

Dallin's volume is an outgrowth of his The Real Soviet Russia, published in 1944 and revised in 1947, in which he set out to correct the many misinformed and wishful accounts of Russia that emerged from the Second World War. Dallin's main contribution during his long career as a perceptive

student of the Soviet system has been in the fields of social development and foreign policy. He combines these two themes in his latest volume, without however discussing in any detail the growth of the economic system which many would regard as the main achievement of the Soviet regime. At the same time he makes a very convincing case for his argument that Russia, especially after 1928, has undergone a vast and irreversible social upheaval comparable to the English revolution of the seventeenth century and the French of the eighteenth. He estimates that by 1940 there were four classes in Russian society: an upper class comprising 14 per cent of the active population, or about 10 or 11 millions; a working class of 18 to 20 millions; some 40 million peasants, practically all collectivized; and perhaps as many as 7 to 12 million inhabitants of forced labor camps. The lack of statistics since 1940 has prevented him from making a more up-to-date analysis, but he suggests that the upper class has grown relatively in size, while the number of forced laborers has declined. He elaborates this scheme in some detail, although it is a long cry from the analysis which a trained sociologist could make on the basis of the materials now available.

Dallin demonstrates clearly enough, however, that the outcome of Stalin's revolution bears little resemblance to the social teachings of Marx or even Lenin. The new upper class still has close personal and emotional bonds with the workers and the peasants, from which it recently emerged, but its main interest is in personal security and order rather than egalitarianism or revolution. Indeed the beginnings of a new system of privilege exist, although it is only thirty years since the upheaval of 1928 and the new elite has not yet had time to solidify. The class divisions in the new Russia are thus more than counterbalanced by the larger unity provided by the common experience of social change, as Dallin sees it, and the government rests solidly on the loyalty of some 24,000,000 citizens—some 20 per cent of the adult population—who are members of the party and the Komsomol. In foreign affairs as in domestic, Soviet policy has travelled a long road. The idea of spontaneous uprisings has long since given way to that of revolutions sponsored by Soviet aid: military in the 1940's, and economic and technical in the 1950's. The picture thus emerges from Dallin's account of a Communist regime that is stable, despite a social policy which places only secondary emphasis on human welfare, and prepared to use its vast power to promote Communism abroad wherever this can be done without undue risk.

An important question which is not adequately answered in these three accounts is that of the meaning of Russia's revolution to the outside world. One may question, for instance, whether Kohn's narrative supports his belief that Russia's natural path was akin to that of liberal Europe. European liberalism, shared by Europe's offshoots in America and Oceania, is the result of a centuries-long process in which political principles were evolved well before the economic development which made their full implementation possible. In Russia the situation was almost the reverse. The rapid social changes after 1861, which Kohn tends to underestimate since his

interest is primarily political, resulted in an industrial economy which was the fifth largest in the world at a time when parliamentary experience was in its infancy. In parts of Asia a far more extreme situation exists, with electronic and perhaps nuclear techniques becoming available in countries where illiteracy is almost universal.

Curtiss is not concerned with the larger significance of the revolution, except indirectly insofar as he gives the three alternative regimes—Tsarist, Provisional, and Bolshevik—an equal chance at solving Russia's problems. The implication of his account is the matter-of-fact view that any class, party, or government which was able and willing to make the necessary reforms held the future of Russia in its hands. This concentration on the immediate issues of the revolutionary year commands respect, but since the rest of the world is so accustomed to associating the Russian revolution with Marxism one wishes that Curtiss had given more attention to theoretical considerations. Dallin's interest is in pointing out the contrasts between Soviet realities and the image of social democracy in Russia presented by misinformed commentators. He therefore devotes little attention to relating this unique system to the problems of other countries in a similar stage of development.

What is lacking in all three accounts, and indeed in most American discussion of the Soviet system is a concern with the Russian experience since 1861 as a pattern of modernization. What are the universal problems of modernization? What solutions to these problems have been found by Russian governments—Tsarist, Provisional, and Soviet? How relevant are the Russian solutions to the rest of the world? Perhaps these questions go beyond the assignments of our three authors, but they must be answered if the larger meaning of the Russian revolution is to be clarified.

C. E. Black
Princeton University

P. N. Miljukov. Vospominanija (1859-1917). Ed. by M. M. Karpovich and B. I. Elkin. 2 vols. New York: Chekhov Publishing House, 1955. 438, 396 pp.; $3.00 each volume.

The publication of this work was awaited with genuine impatience by everyone interested in the political and cultural life of Russia in the last decades of the Tsarist regime and the period of the Provisional Government: the personality of the author is inextricably associated with this important era in the history of the country.

Among his contemporaries Miljukov is one of the most remarkable because of the scope of his genius, and the diversity of his interests reflected in his memoirs renders the book unusually impressive. The author began to work systematically on his memoirs only when he was almost 82; he embarked on it only when the political situation in France, where he was living, put an end to his journalistic work (after the Nazi occupation of Paris the Russian daily, Poslednie novosti, edited by Miljukov

for many years, ceased to appear) and when living as a refugee at Montpelier in Southern France he was forced because of ill health "into a semi-supine position," as he says. He intended to bring his memoirs up to the November 1917 Bolshevik coup d'état, but his death in March 1943 prevented him from carrying out his original plan. Thus his memoirs come to an abrupt close with the Kornilov Rebellion in the summer of 1917.

The web of Miljukov's life was woven of three distinct strands, each of which can be traced in this posthumous work. He started his mature life as a historian. The description of the years spent by him at the University of Moscow, where the ideas of the young scholar became crystallized in long contacts with such teachers as Ključevskij and Vinogradov, represent a valuable addition to the literature dealing with the history of the growth of the social sciences in Russia in the 80's and 90's of the last century. As a result of the growing reactionary trends in governmental policies the academic work of Miljukov did not last long—in 1895 he was expelled from the University of Moscow, was denied the possibility of continuing his teaching career, and was exiled to a provincial town for several years. After serving this sentence Miljukov started a decade which was spent mostly beyond Russia's borders. For a while he was professor of history at the Institute of Higher Learning at Sofia, where he replaced Dragomanov. The American reader will be particularly interested in Miljukov's next position, that of occupant of the chair of Slavic history at the University of Chicago, as the successor of Thomas G. Masaryk. Miljukov spent the academic year 1903-4 at Chicago and later gave a series of lectures at the Lowell Institute in Boston (where he was again invited eighteen years later). Miljukov's well-known book, Russia and Its Crisis, is based on lectures in this country. The pages of his memoirs dedicated to his impressions of American life are extremely vivid and instructive.

In 1905 the first stage of Miljukov's life came to an end. The scholar who had already gained a prominent place among Russian historians plunges headlong into the whirlpool of Russian politics, not from personal ambitions, but as "an inevitable result of the epoch." What happened to Miljukov happened to a considerable number of Russian intellectuals who were pulled into political activity and were forced to set aside their free professions. The appearance of Miljukov on the political scene coincided with the profound revival of opposition trends in Russia culminating in the manifesto of October 17, 1905. It became Miljukov's destiny to play such a prominent part in the political life of his country that in the minds of most of his contemporaries Miljukov the politician almost eclipsed Miljukov the scholar. To a certain degree this is confirmed by the character of his memoirs, which are basically political memories. This explains one of the most characteristic traits of the book—its fighting character. Miljukov, one of the foremost participants of the Russian liberation movement, leader of a political party, official spokesman for liberalism in the Russian parliament, did not suffer from a weakness which V. Odoevskij referred to as "pride in one's own humility." For Miljukov the bitter fight which he led as a politician between 1905 and 1917

was not a thing of the past; many pages of his memoirs represent an extension of the political arena in which he battled with such vigor. The years did not mellow him, and the polemics against his adversaries are continued in the pages of his work. It is natural that in these arguments he deals with many controversial problems, approaching them in an extremely subjective fashion and occasionally erring against historical facts (particularly in his attacks on Kerenskij and other members of the Provisional Government). For the study of Miljukov the politician his memoirs are an invaluable source.

A by-product of Miljukov's political preoccupation was his journalistic work. This began in 1905 when he became one of the editors of the daily, Narodnaja Svoboda, in St. Petersburg, and continued uninterruptedly during the whole period covered by the memoirs. During all these years Miljukov was closely associated with the official organ of the Constitutional Democratic Party—another daily, Rečʹ. His memoirs are interspersed with valuable material for the history of Russian journalism.

In his book Miljukov pays little attention to his own personal life; nevertheless, the figure of Miljukov the man appears clearly. We are fortunate to be able to follow the development of this complicated and talented personality, who possessed a unique vitality and a boundless capacity for knowledge. Thanks to his work a significant and colorful portrait has been added to the hall of fame of Russian intellectuals. Absolute moral integrity, courage in the defense of his opinions, an untiring devotion to the task which he set himself, a sincere adherence to democratic principles—these are the elements of Miljukov's character which emerge from the pages of his memoirs. One can only regret that relatively little attention was given by him to the personal story of his life.

Michael Ginsburg
Indiana University

A. Soloviev and R. Jakobson. Slovo o polku Igoreve v perevodax vosemnadcatogo veka. (Studies in Russian Epic Tradition published under the auspices of the Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Harvard University, No. 1.) Leiden: E. Brill, 1954. 52 pp.

Professor Roman Jakobson, whose monumental apology of the Slovo published in 1949 offered convincing proof of the Igor Tale's authenticity, has recently undertaken the publication of a new series on the Russian epic tradition. In the first issue of this series A. Soloviev and he analyze the earliest translations of the Tale into modern Russian. Since these translations emanated from the same circle of erudite Russians, such as Malinovskij, Bantyš-Kamenskij, and Karamzin, who participated in the discovery and first edition of this great Russian epic, a systematic investigation of these translations is of the greatest importance in the further verification of the Slovo's authenticity.

Mr. Soloviev analyzes the text prepared for Empress Catherine II by Bantyš-Kamenskij, whom Professor A. Mazon considered to have forged the Tale. This analysis shows that Bantyš-Kamenskij was incapable, not only of composing such a work but even of translating it properly into modern Russian. He confused the semantics and grammatical forms, offering such mistranslations as dejanie for bylina, za Šelomenju (a proper name) for za Šelomenem, pobeda for obida, vozvratiti for potrepati, etc.

Professor Jakobson studies the manuscript prepared for Prince A. Belosel'skij, the working drafts of A. F. Malinovskij, and some passages translated by Karamzin. Both Malinovskij and Karamzin were likewise unable to disentangle difficult idioms and passages of the Slovo. The word xoti 'spouses,' for instance, became prixoti, etc. In many places the translations of Malinovskij and other well-known historians are either erroneous or too free. Malinovskij's drafts, however, illustrate that even these faulty renderings were achieved only after considerable labor, which would have been unnecessary in the case of a forgery. The concluding statement of Professor Jakobson's monograph, that "a deep and unsurpassable abyss separated our monument (the Slovo) and the entire world of artistic speech and culture of pre-Mongolian Russia from late eighteenth-century Moscow society," further confirms the unlikelihood that Russian scholars of that time were capable of forging such a magnificent poetic work.

Serge Zenkovsky
Harvard University

N. A. Gorchakov. Istorija sovetskogo teatra. N. Y.: Chekhov Publishing House, 1956. 414 pp. $3.00.

Nicholas A. Gorchakov. The Theater in Soviet Russia. Tr. Edgar Lehrman. N. Y.: Columbia University Press, 1957. xiv, 480, $10.00. 65 illustrations.

The author of the books under review was a very experienced theater specialist under the Soviets. Of course, in some 400-500 pages it was possible to touch only upon the most important points, and the author has not given a history of the Soviet theater in a strict sense, but rather an outline of the Soviet theater. He attempts to write objectively, but he does not hesitate to judge by or reveal his own sympathies, which may not appeal to every reader. However, he has a talent for observation and an originality of ideas.

Though the two books cover essentially the same ground, and the judgments and picture and judgments presented are basically the same, the English-language volume is by no means a simple translation of the Russian-language book. For the English-language volume, the author adds an entire section (pp. 3-93) on the Russian theater before the Revolution, and throughout the work he gives commentary which will be of interest and value for the English-reading non-specialist. In addition, he

gives much more copious notes in this edition, and he includes an extremely helpful Index and illustrations.

The following has been underlined in the books: (1) the bold and original experiments in the Russian theater before the Revolution—later, these searches were paralyzed by the Bolshevists; (2) the attempts to resist the communist utilitarian and ideological pressure in many a theater and by distinguished managers—such attempts were possible before 1930, especially during the NEP; (3) finally, the theatrical art was suffocated even though, quantitatively, theatrical institutions were expanding and growing in the USSR: they were obliged to propagate "the general line of the party."

What mainly concerns Gorchakov? It is (1) to demonstrate the Soviet theater policy: the decisions of the party, the opinions of the press, the theater declarations; (2) to investigate the evolution of the directors' aims (he belongs by his opinions evidently to those theater men who give the director the central role and the player a subordinate one). The book largely ignores actors, though it might have included an interesting gallery of the Soviet players, among whom many are very talented and worthy of being characterized particularly. The players are surely the prime personages in the theater.

Among the managers there are marked out with too great attention Mejerxol'd, Tairov, Stanislavsky, Nemirovič–Dančenko, Vaxtangov, and M. Čexov (before his emigration from the USSR). Perhaps it was not worth speaking so in detail of Mejerxol'd, whose portrait was given in another book of the Chekhov Publishing House: J. Elagin, Temnyj Genii. Gorchakov gives many of the same ideas that are in Elagin's book, with whom our author has common interests, and uses the disputable epithet "genius" for Mejerxol'd. On the other hand, there was need for the portrait of Tairov, and one can say the same about the splendid, concise, and expressive sketch on Vaxtangov, and the sketch of the life of the Moscow Art Theater during the Soviet period.

The too fugitive remarks on Soviet dramaturgy will hardly help the ordinary reader to a clear idea of the character of the Soviet tragedies, dramas, and comedies (in the main one recollects having read only Trenev's Ljubov' Jarovaja); the supplement (in the Russian-language edition) on the children's theater and especially of the theater of the nations of the USSR is only information notes, far from the main theme of the book.

There cannot be unnoticed some errors in the books, as e.g. the following ones: a total condemnation of the prerevolutionary imperial theaters as rutinerskie, i.e., theaters that stopped in their evolution, though in the years 1907-17 actually there were many innovations in presentations of ballet, opera, and drama. The pages where Lenin's fight against the Proletkult is described are unclear and contradictory, and it is unintelligible which side is in the right (or are both parts in the wrong?)

Nevertheless these defects do not keep the books of Gorčakov from being interesting, fresh, and valuable texts for those who love the theater and its history. In comparison with Soviet publications—full of falsification—on the same theme, the

books of Gorchakov are full of heart-felt truth and are warmed by ardent love of free art of the theater.

Peter Yershov
New York City

Wacław Lednicki. Bits of Table Talk on Pushkin, Mickiewicz, Goethe, Turgenev, and Sienkiewicz. (International Scholar's Forum, No. 5.) The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1956. x, 263 pp.

A companion volume to the author's Russia, Poland and the West, Bits of Table Talk is a collection of ten essays devoted to comparative studies in Russian and Polish literatures.

The first four essays are primarily Puškin studies. "The Prose of Pushkin" is a general survey of the poet's prose works and their significance in the history of Russian prose style. The traditional myth of Gogol' as the "father of Russian prose" is made short work of by Professor Lednicki, who assigns this place in the history of Russian literature to the author of Eugene Onegin. The ideological and stylistic significance of this work for the later Russian novel is discussed at some length.

The whole complex literary genealogy of The Snowstorm forms the subject of the following study. The author takes his readers on a fascination tour through world literature as he investigates the history of the roman d'aventures from its origins in the Greek novel down to the ninteenth century and Puškin's masterful short story.

"The Nest of Gentlefolk and the 'Poetry of Marriage and the Hearth'" is a study of the enormous influence of Puškin revealed in many of Turgenev's works, from his earliest poems through his mature productions. Puškin's theme of the "family nest" and the longing for it is echoed strongly in many of Turgenev's short stories, as well as Sportsman's Sketches and such major novels as On the Eve, Fathers and Sons, and, especially, Nest of Gentlefolk.

With the controversial reference in Puškin's Monument to aleksandrijskij stolp as his starting point, Professor Lednicki in his next essay ("Pushkin's 'Monument'") enters into an extended philological examination of the whole poem. After convincingly demonstrating that aleksandrijskij refers to Tsar Alexander I, Professor Lednicki proceeds to a discussion of the two themes around which Monument is centered. One, the imperishable prestige of the poet, derives from Horace and Juvenal, and links "Monument" with a number of works in which Puškin expressed his views on poets and poetry. The second theme of Monument—a social or even political one—is the necessity of the unsubmissive poet's dedication to the cause of freedom.

The fifth and sixth essays are devoted to Mickiewicz. "Adam Mickiewicz: Poland's Romantic Ambassador to the Court of Realism" is a study of Forefathers' Eve, Part III. Mickiewicz himself took no active part in the Polish Insurrection of 1830-31. Forefathers' Eve, Part III appears to

Professor Lednicki as an act of expiation. By magnifying in importance the incident of the Wilno students in 1824, Mickiewicz desired to show that he too had suffered for the national cause. Without such an act of purification, Mickiewicz would not have been able to write his Books of the Polish Nation and Pilgrimage, in which he assumes the role of spiritual leader of the émigré Poles. In "Mickiewicz at the Collège de France," Professor Lednicki traces in detail the history of the organization of the first chair of "Slavic Language and Literature" at the Collège de France. This chair was occupied by Mickiewicz between December 1840 and May 1844.

"Ex Oriente Lux (Pushkin and Mickiewicz)" and "Pushkin's Tazit and Mickiewicz's Konrad Wallenrod" are studies on various aspects of the Puškin-Mickiewicz relationship. Of the two, the one on Tazit and Konrad Wallenrod seems the more interesting. Here Professor Lednicki shows rather convincingly that Puškin's unfinished poem Tazit, published previously under the erroneous titles Ghalub or Ghasub, was designed as a polemic against Mickiewicz's highly controversial Konrad Wallenrod. "Ex Oriente Lux" is a rather rambling investigation of the oriental elements in the works of both Puškin and Mickiewicz.

In "Goethe and the Russian and Polish Romantics," Professor Lednicki sets out to prove that of the Russian and Polish Romantics who knew Goethe, none liked him. While it was possible for them to admire his genius, they felt only disgust for the man. For them he was a Philistine, petty, egotistical, and (most important) "unfeeling." They resented his indifference and detachment. Although the Russians, especially Gercen, were vociferous in the expression of their dislike, the Poles treated him with silence.

The tenth and last chapter, "Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846-1946)," is a revaluation of this famous Polish novelist, whose fame Professor Lednicki now sees in eclipse. All the major works of Sienkiewicz are reviewed in this lengthy study, and their contribution to Polish and world literature demonstrated. Professor Lednicki concludes his essay with personal reminiscences of a meeting with Sienkiewicz in 1913.

The collection of the essays reviewed in a single volume is certainly a happy occasion not only for Slavicists, but also for students of Comparative Literature. Backed by Professor Lednicki's solid erudition, they contain a wealth of information and viewpoints that are often as stimulating as they are provocative.

H. B. Segel
University of Florida

Yar Slavutych. The Muse in Prison: Eleven Sketches of Ukrainian Poets Killed by Communists and Twenty-Two Translations of Their Poems. Foreword by C. A. Manning. Jersey City, N. J.: Svoboda, 1956. 63 pp.

The book under review is an English version of two previous publications of Slavutych in Ukrainian: Modern Ukrainian

Poetry (Philadelphia, 1950) and Rozstriljana Muza (The Shot Muse) (Detroit, 1955). The Muse in Prison gives biographies and selections of poetry in translation of the following Ukrainian writers: M. Zerov, P. Fylypovyč, M. Draj-Xmara, D. Zahul, M. Johansen, J. Plužnyk, V. Svidzins'kyj, D. Falkiv's'kyj, O. Vlyz'ko, M. Antox. All of them were liquidated by the Soviet regime during the twenties of this century and their works were forbidden in the Soviet Ukraine. Together with them the literary societies (e.g., "Lanka," "Mars," "Pluh," "Hart," "Vaplite," "Vuspp") were dissolved. The Soviet government opened a general attack against Ukrainian culture; the destruction of the Ukrainian intellectual and literary elite was accompanied by the destruction of the Ukrainian peasantry by the Soviet kolkhoz system. Millions of peasants were deported and disappeared. Six million more were starved in the artificial famine of 1933. Slavutych gives the names and data of 41 executed poets (pp. 16-17) and 125 men of letters "deported to concentration camps where they disappeared without a trace" (pp. 17-20).

After the opulent development of Ukrainian literature in the twenties, the thirties became a black mark on the history of Ukrainian culture. It was only in the late forties that Ukrainian literature saw a renewal, but only in exile in Western Europe, the U.S.A., and Canada.

All this is very striking. It is presented by Slavutych with extraordinary adroitness and with overwhelming knowledge of material. On p. 20 the author writes: "Most materials given in this book are very rare and not widely known, even in Ukrainian publications." This was true up to the publication of G. Luckyj's Literary Politics in the Soviet Ukraine, 1917-1934 (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956).

Despite its essayistic character, anthological approach, and its selectivity in presenting only ten authors from a large number of those deserving it, Slavutych's little volume has its historical value. It brings to the American reader some knowledge of the impressive literary movement which burst into bloom after 1917 and which continued for about a decade, until it was ruthlessly crushed and its workers liquidated by order of the Soviet regime. A foreword by Prof. C. A. Manning and a general bibliography (pp. 59-63) increase the value of this book.

J. B. Rudnyćkyj
University of Manitoba

J. B. Rudnyćkyj. Slavische und indogermanische Akzentdubletten. (Slavistica, No. 22.) Winnipeg: Verlag der Ukrainischen Freien Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1955. 48 pp.

The subject matter of this study, based on Indo-European and Slavic (chiefly Ukrainian) examples, is the formal and functional differentiation of words and sentences, deriving from the different positions of the accent. The author's

interest is focused primarily on the problem of "functional" and "non-functional" accent-differences; his title notwithstanding, he does not present his analysis as an Indo-Europeanist or, for that matter, as a Slavist. Following the lead of Romansky in a study on the functions of accent, the author proposes a more precise and exhaustive classificatory scheme of the accentual doublets than Romansky had made. By "functional" doublets Rudnyćkyj means forms in which the difference in accent is accompanied by different lexical or grammatical meanings. The lexical doublets are subdivided into (1) appellative, (2) appellative-onomastic, and (3) onomastic. The grammatical doublets are subdivided into (1) morphological, (2) inflectional, and (3) syntactic. Whereas the "functional" doublets are classified more or less synchronically, the classification of the "non-functional" doublets is shifted to the historical plane; the subdivisions are as follows here: (1) analogical levelling, (2) mutual influences of different accentual systems, (3) influences due to rhythm and rhyme, (4) facultative accent-doublets.

Objections can be raised with respect to the author's classification. The lexical doublets concern either proper names or common substantives and are therefore not analogous to the three-fold distinction which is set up on the grammatical level. The "morphological" type should more precisely be called derivational, since flexion is also a part of morphology. The syntactic type is treated in a prefunctory manner and the author fails to distinguish between obligatory and optional accent-differences. By "non-functional" doublets the author means forms in free variation. His historical approach precludes the possibility of discerning functional, stylistic differences on the level of synchrony as well; hence also the unfortunate term of "non-functional" for these forms. This section of the book raises a number of interesting historical questions, such as the elimination of accentual contrasts within certain patterns, the interference of different accent-systems, and accentual deviations permissible in poetry. Each of these problems deserves elaborate treatment, especially within the history of the Ukrainian language. Unfortunately, the author does not provide us with the answers to questions of such scope and intricacy.

Edward Stankiewicz
Indiana University

J. B. Rudnyćkyj. Ukrainian-Canadian Folklore and Dialectological Texts, (Ukrainica Occidentalia, III [1].) Winnipeg: UVAN, 1956. xvi, 280 pp.

Dziobko, J. Ukrainian Lemko and other Folksongs. Winnipeg: Ukrainian Canadian Pioneer's Library, No. 1., 1956. 128 pp.

These two books can be reviewed together because the larger part of Mr. Dziobko's work is published in the first

volume, pp. 193-272, and the Pioneer's Library is obviously intended to present in a more personal form the contributions of individuals to the collection of Ukrainian materials found in Canada.

The Ukrainians in Canada came in general from the same cultural background, chiefly in Eastern Galicia and the Carpathians, as did those in the United States. However, in the United States they tended to settle in the industrial and mining districts where they were and remained in the minority. In Canada, they gravitated, not without government encouragement, to the virgin lands of the prairie provinces, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. There they settled in villages and districts which acquired a Ukrainian majority and for many years maintained their own language, manners, and customs. It is only since World War II that a strong Ukrainian movement to such cities as Toronto has begun. As a result Ukrainians have not only maintained themselves as a more compact whole than in the United States, but they have acquired great political importance in Canadian life.

Prof. Rudnyćkyj, who arrived in Canada after World War II, has been doing an invaluable work in preserving the monuments of the vanishing past of the pioneer Ukrainians, but this is his first extensive publication in this field.

The volume consists of stories and songs which he or some other Ukrainian has taken down in some of the often remote villages which have had relatively little contact with the urban life and have preserved with considerable fidelity their Ukrainian traditions.

It would be interesting to compare these songs with their counterparts written down in Ukraine, for they show an intermingling of dialects under Canadian conditions. Furthermore, there is an interesting introduction of English words to denote certain basic differences between Ukrainian and Canadian life. Thus the seljanyn, living on the large estate, has been largely replaced by the independent farmar, farmer on his homsted or hoštat. (Cf. my "American-Slavonic," American Speech, XI [1936], 370-371). A study of these words and others like them would reveal a great deal of the social history and psychological transformation of the average Ukrainian Canadian.

At the same time there has been a conscious effort to preserve the old and to express Canadian life under the old categories that the people knew in the homeland. The Ukrainian gift for the improvisation of folksongs did not die out on their arrival in Canada and (pp. 59-76) expressed the longings of the Ukrainian for his native land in patterns reminiscent of the old Kozak and čumak songs, but with a Canadian content and Canadian references. At the same time, Prof. Rudnyćkyj includes (pp. 1-32) anecdotes, folk etymologies, and jokes that accompanied the settlement. Some of these are certainly retellings of old traditional stories current either in Ukraine or Canada as No. 2, Počatky Flin Flon (the Beginnings of Flin Flon), although we cannot deny the possibility that such an incident actually occurred.

This volume is frankly a collection of materials. It is a storehouse of information and of specimens which requires special reworking and evaluation to fit them into Ukrainian

studies, but it is exactly the type of material which is rapidly perishing and will be irreplaceable as the older men and women die and their children merge with the developing Canadian life and with the newer Ukrainians who have brought with them not only the oral but also the literary tradition. Prof. Rudnyćkyj is certainly to be congratulated for his industry and so too must Mr. Dziobko for the energy which he has expended on the collection of songs for many years.

Clarence A. Manning
Columbia University

Mischa H. Fayer, Aron Pressman, and Anastasia F. Pressman. Simplified Russian Grammar. New York: Pitman, 1957. xvi, 408, $6.25.

This textbook is actually a new edition of Bondar's Simplified Russian Method, 7th ed., 1949, although no indication of this is found in the Preface. The Grammar is of the same length and general arrangement as its predecessor. No significant changes were made.

This text makes a good over-all impression. The reading selections are in fluent, colloquial Russian, with excellent material for conversation. The opening lessons are especially adaptable to oral drill. In general, the grammar is explained clearly. A complete presentation of Russian handwriting is offered. Several songs are printed with music as an aid to the teacher. Four chapters are devoted to the aspects. The appendix and glossaries are done well. The Grammar has been proofread most carefully: misprints are practically nil. Those who desire for first year work a detailed, thorough grammar should find this textbook most suitable.

However, those who would prefer for beginners a short, simple grammar will find this text too bulky. This is the main criticism regarding the Grammar. Does it not tend to overpower the student by its sheer weight? Would it not be advisable, in view of high mortality rates in Russian courses, to give the student a feeling of accomplishment by allowing him to overcome only one obstacle at a time? Why not in a beginners' grammar concentrate on the basic structure of Russian, leaving much of the vocabulary learning to readers and the advanced grammar to the second year?

There is no indication that Josselson's Word Count was used. However, an analysis of the Grammar vocabulary (c. 1100 words) revealed the following interesting facts: (1) 85% of the vocabulary was found to be in the Word Count (all 6 Lists); (2) 80% of Josselson's High Frequency List (List 1) was in the vocabulary, 52% of List 2, 25% of List 3, 20% of List 4, and 13% of List 5.

The following specific defects were noted in the Grammar. Numbers in parentheses refer to its pages. Other references are to the Academy Grammatika (Moscow 1953-54): The phonetic introduction is not adequate: no provision for systematic drill in pronunciation and reading is supplied. The indication that i, phonetically, is nothing but y preceded by a y-glide

is erroneous (9). In the exercises there is too much emphasis on straight translation. In a few spots the English becomes stilted: 'I never saw your blue desk or your remarkable lamp with the green lampshade' (110). It is misleading to imply that the genitive is always used after negative verbs (72). The use of the accusative is often possible and preferable; Acad. Gram., II, 123. The accusative plural of kukla should not be kukly (140), but kukol; Acad. Gram., I, 107. The genitive plural stress of okno is in current Russian not okón (175), but more usually ókon; Acad. Gram., I, 197. The stress of úzki (186) in the sense of 'too narrow' should be uzkí; Acad. Gram., I, 326.

The explanation of predicate adjective usage is done poorly (189-190). It is an oversimplification to say that the long form generally denotes a permanent quality, whereas the short form is used for a temporary quality. Often either form is quite possible. The Acad. Gram., II, 450, points out that constructions such as on umnyj and on umën can be synonymous. It should have been stated that the long form is often characteristic of a conversational style, and the short form, of a literary style. The Grammar omits treatment of those adjectives which, although possessing a long form, are always short in the predicate: gotov, nužen, dolžen, etc.

In present day Russian the instrumental of vosem' is not vosem'ju (228), but usually vos'm'ju; Acad. Gram., I, 376. After the numerals 2, 3, 4, the adjective is more often not genitive (229), but nominative before plural nominative—accusative feminine nouns; Acad. Gram., I, 374. 'At a quarter to six' is usually bez četverti šest', and not v bez četverti šest' (256). The use of drug when referring to woman should be explained (257). Pribežat' is not the perfective of bežat' (335), but of pribegat'.

The punctuation is defective in spots. Often a dependent clause is not set off by a comma (99, 117, 145, 156, etc.). A dash should separate a subject noun from a predicate noun when no copula is present (41).

The Russian-English vocabulary is generally good but should have included irregular genitive plurals.

Morton Benson
Ohio University

A Wide Choice of Textbooks—Teaching Aids

for study of RUSSIAN by non-Russian students regularly used in middle school and colleges in the USSR

LATEST EDITIONS of ENGLISH-RUSSIAN and RUSSIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARIES (new orthography)

GEOGRAPHICAL ATLASES and MAPS

Inexpensive editions of Russian CLASSIC WORKS used by most American schools for students' reading assignments

TALKING PHONOGRAPH RECORDS
acts from plays — monologues

Excellent for students' practice study in pronunciation

Ask for our TX 57 Catalogue

Four Continent Book Corp.

822 Broadway, New York 3, N. Y.

Phone: GR 3-2018

"The outstanding general journal of modern language teaching in the United States"

THE MODERN LANGUAGE JOURNAL

brings to its readers every month stimulating and helpful articles on methods, materials, pedagogical research, publications and textbooks in the field.

Edited by Camillo P. Merlino, Boston University, Boston, Massachusetts. Published by the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations.

Eight issues a year, monthly except June, July, August, and September. Current subscription $4.00 a year. Foreign countries, $4.50 a year net in U.S.A. funds.

Sample copy on request

The Modern Language Journal

Stephen L. Pitcher, Business Manager

7144 Washington Avenue
ST. LOUIS 5, MISSOURI

1948 SLAVISTICA 19

A series relating to Slavic language literatures, cultures, ethnography, archeology etc., with special attention to the problems of Eastern Slavic world.

Appears three times a year.
Price: $0.50 per copy.

Edited by:
Prof. J. B. RUDNYĆKYJ
The University of Manitoba

Published by:
Ukrainian Free Academy of Sciences

UVAN OF CANADA
P. O. Box 3597, Sta. B.,
Winnipeg, Man., Canada.

